

Isaiah 40,20 – A Case of Not Seeing the Wood for the Trees

The first two words of Isa 40,20 have caused much difficulty to translators and commentators. There have been numerous attempts to explain them, but no consensus has emerged. The present article is intended first to introduce some order into this confused situation by grouping the proposals into five categories so that future commentators may at least start with a clear idea of what the available options are, how they have developed and how they are related to one another. Secondly, I shall seek to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each group and hence towards the end of the article to advance some fresh considerations in support of one category rather than the others. It should be noted in passing that there is no discussion here of wider literary setting. Isa 40,19-20 is often considered to have been inserted secondarily into its present context, along with comparable passages in Isa 41 and 44⁽¹⁾. Important as this question may be, it does not seriously affect the prior task of arriving at a satisfactory translation of the verses in question.

The Hebrew consonantal text of Isa 40,20 is as follows:

הַמִּסְכֵּן תְּרוּמָה עֵץ לֹא-יִדְקֶה יִבְחֹר
חֹרֵשׁ חֲכָם יִבְקֹשׁ-לוֹ לִהְיוֹת פֶּסֶל לֹא יִמוּט:

⁽¹⁾ See the recent discussion of R. P. MERENDINO, *Der Erste und der Letzte. Eine Untersuchung von Jes 40–48* (SVT 31; Leiden 1981) 87-95. Voices raised in the modern period against the majority opinion include H. D. PREUSS, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im Alten Testament* (BWANT 92; Stuttgart 1971) 193-203; H. C. SPYKERBOER, *The Structure and Composition of Deutero-Isaiah, with special Reference to the Polemics against Idolatry* (Mappel 1976); R. F. MELUGIN, *The Formation of Isaiah 40–55* (BZAW 141; Berlin and New York 1976) 33-35, 90-93; R. J. CLIFFORD, "The Function of Idol Passages in Second Isaiah", *CBQ* 42 (1980) 450-464; M. B. DICK, "Prophetic *Poiēsis* and the Verbal Icon", *CBQ* 46 (1984) 226-246; and E. W. CONRAD, "The 'Fear Not' Oracles in Second Isaiah", *VT* 34 (1984) 129-152.

The Revised Version offers this translation:

He that is too impoverished for *such* an oblation chooseth a tree that will not rot; he seeketh unto him a cunning workman to set up a graven image, that shall not be moved.

I

The first approach to the problem of the first two words of this verse needs to be noted only briefly, for it comprises those who give up the struggle altogether by simply omitting them. The Peshiṭta gives no equivalent for them in its translation⁽²⁾, while in IQIsa^a they are written by a different hand from the remainder⁽³⁾: presumably the first scribe left a blank here because he could not read the words of his *Vorlage* or else found them unintelligible. In modern times, North⁽⁴⁾ has written of this phrase that "there is much to be said for deleting it", whilst Elliger⁽⁵⁾, who is not usually at a loss for suggestions to get round textual obscurities, is also unable to offer a translation despite his lengthy discussion.

⁽²⁾ So correctly *BHS*. Its presentation of the evidence from the other versions is less satisfactory, however, for it implies that the first word was omitted or not read by the translators of the LXX, and likewise the Vulgate and Targum for the second word. The fact is, however, that all these versions read something here; in a passage of such obscurity, where it is just as likely that the ancient versions were struggling as that they were following an alternative Hebrew text, it is questionable method to press their renderings to produce putative evidence as to the detail of their *Vorlagen*.

⁽³⁾ Cf. M. BURROWS, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Volume 1: The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven 1950), Plate xxxiii, line 19; M. H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah, Volume Two, Chapters 22-44* (Jerusalem 1981) 177. M. MARTIN also accepts that the words "were inserted by the second scribe"; cf. *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Louvain 1958) 546. I cannot follow his subsequent reasoning, however, when he states, "They were obviously inserted on an erasure as the space is not big enough for them". There is no physical evidence of an erasure, so far as I know. There is no need to assume any more than that the first scribe did not leave quite enough space.

⁽⁴⁾ C. R. NORTH, *The Second Isaiah. Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters xl-lv* (Oxford 1964) 82.

⁽⁵⁾ K. ELLIGER, *Deuteronesaja: 1. Teilband. Jesaja 40,1-45,7* (BKAT XI/1; Neukirchen 1978) 59-62.

This approach, of course, can only ever be a last resort in textual criticism. With the exception of the Peshitta, the versions are at least sufficient to indicate that something was read here in antiquity, even if it was not understood. Thus, for instance, if the first scribe of IQIsa^a initially left a gap, that implies that something must have stood at this point in his *Vorlage*. This is true also, it should be noted in passing, of the Vulgate. *BHK* used consistently to annotate the words with the symbol “>V”, but an examination by Stummer⁽⁶⁾ has shown that this was misleading, as recent commentators and *BHS* agree.

II

We turn next to a consideration of the traditional interpretation of our verse in the English versions. It is represented by the Revised Version, cited above, with which the Authorized Version, the New International Version and the Good News Bible are comparable. The Revised Standard Version construes the first clause slightly differently, but it clearly stands within the same tradition: “He who is impoverished chooses for an offering wood that will not rot...”⁽⁷⁾.

In this view, *ṭrûmâ* is, of course, understood as “a contribution for sacred uses” and hence “an offering”. *ham^ssukkân* is construed as the pu‘al participle (with the definite article) of the third root *skn* listed in BDB. As such it is a hapax legomenon, but from the same root are derived the adjective *miskên*, “poor”, which occurs four times in Ecclesiastes (only), and the noun *miskēnut*, “poverty”, “scarcity”, which occurs once, at Deut 8,9. There is no need to doubt the meanings of this noun and adjective, despite their restricted attestation; they fit their context and are common in Aramaic

(6) F. STUMMER, “הַמִּסְכֵּן תְּרוּמָה (Jes 40₂₀) in der Vulgata”, *ZAW* 53 (1935) 283-285. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah*, 177, citing Jerome’s commentary, apparently believes that the Vulgate too presupposes the MT at this point, for he comments “hardly om המסכן and תרומה construed as ‘excellent’”.

(7) Comparable renderings are to be found in both French and German translations; see, for example, *La Sainte Bible* and the translation of Martin Luther.

and post-biblical Hebrew⁽⁸⁾. The third root *skn* is thus not unreasonably thought to mean “be poor”, and the pu’al participle “he who is impoverished”, “the poor man”⁽⁹⁾. *hame’sukkān* is then taken to be the subject of the sentence while *terûmā*, as an accusative, can be understood in several different ways, as the translations already cited show. It is not necessary for our purposes to go into further detail about that here.

This line of approach suggests, therefore, that there is a contrast between verses 19 and 20. It is implied that the man of v. 19 is wealthy, and so can afford an idol made from precious metals. The poor man of v. 20, however, can afford only wood with which to make his image.

Despite the familiarity of this interpretation, it confronts a number of difficulties which make it well-nigh impossible to accept. First, there is no support elsewhere in the text for this contrast between rich and poor; indeed, several factors point strongly in the opposite direction. For instance, as commentators have long observed, the allegedly poor man of v. 20 is evidently able to afford the services of a *ḥārāš ḥākām*, “a skilled craftsman”, later in the verse. Again, if this contrast was intended by the writer, why did he not make a reference to it in v. 19? It is expecting too much of the reader if, when he reaches v. 20, he is supposed to retrace his steps mentally in order to comprehend what v. 19 was all about. Next, the question should be raised whether such an interpretation does justice to the overall context which is governed by v. 18. There the challenge was thrown down to produce something that could be compared with God. The response expected is a description of the very best that man can produce; the polemic rather loses its point if a second-rate idol is put up as a candidate. Finally, Smith⁽¹⁰⁾ has queried whether a wooden statue would really have been so much cheaper than a metal one. He writes, “Good wooden statuettes were probably more expensive than bronze”. While Smith does not adduce supporting evidence for his opinion, so that we cannot be

⁽⁸⁾ See, for instance, J. LEVY, *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* (Leipzig 1883) III, 169.

⁽⁹⁾ So far as I am aware, the earliest example of this understanding is in the commentary of Kimḥi, who compares *miskēn* at Qoh 4,13.

⁽¹⁰⁾ S. SMITH, *Isaiah Chapters xl-lv: Literary Criticism and History* (Oxford 1944) 172.

sure that it represents anything more than a hunch on his part, his comment is at least sufficient to make us query whether a truly impoverished man would have been able to afford any kind of image on the scale demanded by this verse. After all, the closing words of the verse show that something far more substantial than a mere statuette is in view. We may thus conclude that there is no justification for contrasting verses 19 and 20 in terms of rich and poor.

A second major difficulty to confront this interpretation lies in its linguistic understanding of *hamesukkān*. It is curious, to say the least, that none of the versions has taken it this way, particularly in view of the fact that they appear to have had no difficulty in recognizing the root at its occurrences in Ecclesiastes. Moreover, if the Masoretes intended it to mean “the poor man”, it is surprising that they vocalized the word as the pu’al participle of a root whose use as a verb is not attested anywhere else. Why did they not simply use the more common vocalization *hammiskēn*? After all, the adjective is used with substantival force at Qoh 9,16. However the Masoretes themselves understood the word, it seems clear that they were acting under the restraint of a tradition of vocalization which refused to equate the word without further ado with the idea of poverty.

Finally, a third difficulty for this approach may lie in its translation of *terûmâ*. Clearly it cannot suit the traditional understanding of “heave-offering”, defined by Wade as “a part lifted or separated from a larger quantity”⁽¹¹⁾. Nor can it suit Driver’s definition of an offering, or portion of an offering, “made to God but received for the use of the officiating priest”⁽¹²⁾. Furthermore, since we have already noted that a more substantial idol than a mere figurine is envisaged, it is questionable whether it would be appropriate to describe it as an “offering” at all, however defined. The uncertainties surrounding the precise significance of *terûmâ* generally mean that it would be hazardous to press an objection on this basis alone. Nevertheless, the first two points, with this third one in possible support, are sufficiently strong, in my opinion, to rule out the interpretation of Isa 40,20 which is so familiar to readers of the English Bible.

⁽¹¹⁾ G. W. WADE, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (London ²1929) 256.

⁽¹²⁾ G. R. DRIVER, “Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch”, *JSS* 1 (1956) 97-105 (104-105).

III

In view of the difficulties posed by the Masoretic Text, it is no surprise to find that a third group of scholars seeks a solution by way of emendation. It is unnecessary, and in any case probably not possible, to list all the suggestions which have been made, but at least the most influential should be noted. Duhm, for instance, observing that the LXX includes the words ὁμοίωμα κατεσκεύασεν αὐτόν at the end of v. 19, proposed emending the first two words of v. 20 to *ham'kōnēn tēmûnâ*, "he who would set up an image (chooses...)"⁽¹³⁾. In somewhat similar vein, Levy suggested reading *hammassikēhu litēmûnâ* "he that causeth the casting thereof for a likeness", i.e. "he who has an image cast"⁽¹⁴⁾.

As so often with conjectural emendations, both these suggestions have the merit of staying quite close to the Hebrew consonantal text and they enjoy a small measure of versional support. They suffer, however, from the inevitable difficulty of being unable to explain how a straightforward and intelligible text was corrupted into something which on this view was quite unintelligible⁽¹⁵⁾. The very fact that the suggestions made are so ingeniously approximated to our MT shows that the proponents of such emendations are not postulating wholesale corruption of the text⁽¹⁶⁾ but rather a misreading by

⁽¹³⁾ B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaia* (HKAT III/1; Göttingen 1914) 270-271. (In the first edition of his commentary [Göttingen 1892], 272, Duhm had proposed reading *ham'sakkēn tēmûnâ*, "Der ein Bildnis schnitzt", postulating a denominative verb *skn* from *sakkîn*, "knife".) Duhm's proposal was favoured by BHK, but has subsequently been dropped by BHS. R. R. OTTLEY, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint* (Cambridge 1906) II, 299, was critical of the appeal to the LXX in support of a similar proposal on the ground of word order. He suggested instead that ὁμοίωμα might be no more than a guess from the context or a rendering of whatever originally stood first in the verse.

⁽¹⁴⁾ R. LEVY, *Deutero-Isaiah* (Oxford 1925) 123-124, followed by J. MULLENBURG, "Isaiah, Chapters 40-66", in G. A. BUTTRICK et al. (ed.), *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York and Nashville 1956) V, 440.

⁽¹⁵⁾ J. REIDER, "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew", *VT* 2 (1952) 113-130, asks "How could our present difficult text have originated from such a simple reading?" The question is reasonable, but not sufficient to declare that all such emendations are "preposterous" (p. 117).

⁽¹⁶⁾ Contrast P. VOLZ, *Jesaia II* (KAT IX; Leipzig 1932) 7-8, who believes

a careless scribe. By the same token, however, the suggestions become *a priori* less probable. This is not, of course, to deny that errors of this kind did sometimes occur in the textual transmission of the Hebrew Bible. The point is rather that there is no apparent reason why it should have occurred just here, and no strong evidence from the versions that it did. As a point of method, therefore, this solution should be adopted only after all other possibilities have been eliminated.

Similar objections and more will apply to one of G. R. Driver's discussions of this verse⁽¹⁷⁾. He suggested reading *hammiskēn tērīmā* or *tērāmā*... , "The poor man (as) a costly image was choosing a wood (that) would not rot". Driver's suggestion deserves mention here nevertheless because of its approach to the second word. He linked this with Akkadian *tarimtu*⁽¹⁸⁾ which, he thought, meant a "sacred object" of some kind, a dedicatory offering of great value. He argued that such a philological treatment would be appropriate if the usual setting of this prophet in the Babylonian exile be correct. As we shall see, understanding of this Akkadian word by the lexicographers has not stood still since Driver first advanced his suggestion, and his interpretation of the first word is clearly unacceptable. Nevertheless, it deserves mention as a "straw in the wind", a hint at an approach which takes the background of the prophet seriously into consideration⁽¹⁹⁾.

As a final proposal in this section on conjectural emendations, reference should be made to an article by Trudinger⁽²⁰⁾, for his dis-

that there has been some deep-seated corruption and proposes a radical rearrangement of the text in consequence. Again, if all else fails, such an approach may be considered, but it should be recognized that it amounts to no more than well-informed guesswork.

(17) G. R. DRIVER, "Linguistic and Textual Problems", *JTS* 36 (1935) 396-406 (396-398).

(18) The spelling of Akkadian words throughout this article follows that of the scholar whose opinion is being discussed on each occasion.

(19) It is of interest to note that Driver rejected the association of *m̄suk-kān* with Akkadian *musukkannu* because (a) it involved violent treatment of the rest of the text, and (b) it is not known that this wood was used for making images. It will be possible later to question these arguments, and Driver himself appears later to have changed his mind on the matter.

(20) P. TRUDINGER, "'To whom then will you liken God?' (A Note on the Interpretation of Isaiah xl 18-20)", *VT* 17 (1967) 220-225.

cussion of the problems of this verse is helpful and it deserves consideration by those who would take matters further. He makes two initial points, of which the first is of particular importance. (a) Verses 19 and 20 describe the making of two different idols. Against the large number of those (including some of the ancient versions) who have thought that only one idol is described, Trudinger reasonably observes that "it would be decidedly odd to deal with the process of overlaying with metal *before* mentioning the selection of wood for the idol's core". (b) The progression of the writer's argument demands that the idol of v. 20 be of superior quality to that of v. 19.

To sustain this approach, Trudinger suggests that *ham^esukkān* should be vocalized *ham^esakkēn*, the pi'el participle of a root *skn*, whose primary meaning, he conjectures, is "to dwell with", and from which is derived (in the hiph'il) the meaning "to be familiar with", "well acquainted with". Hence, he conjectures, the pi'el participle might have the meaning "he who really knows", that is, "the connoisseur of idols"⁽²¹⁾. In what way, then, does this verse describe such a superior idol? Because, suggests Trudinger, it is carved out of a tree which is still *in situ*, roots and all. Arguing that the chief sign of quality in an idol was its immovability, he believes that there could be none better than one carved from the trunk of a tree whose roots are still firmly in the ground.

While Trudinger's presentation of the verse's problems is helpful, his proposed solution is less than convincing. First, the meaning of *m^esakkēn* which he suggests is unlikely, for he postulates an otherwise unattested pi'el of the root and gives it a meaning, which the root nowhere else conveys, as a hypothetical development of only one of several possible meanings of the hiph'il. Second, Trudinger gives no evidence that trees were ever used in this way, nor am I aware of any such practice as he presupposes. Finally, although he does not discuss the meaning of *terûmā* or offer a translation of it, he presumably understands it in the traditional sense of "offering". However, we should then have expected the word to be plural if Trudinger's approach were correct. We may conclude, then,

(21) A similar idea is found already in Rashi, who compares the Masoretic vocalization with *m^elummād* and the meaning with *hahaskēn hiskantī* (Num 23,30), "have I been accustomed/in the habit of...?", and so renders "the experienced one".

that although it is possible to suggest emendations of this phrase which stay close to the MT, they raise other problems of various kinds with the result that they are not ultimately convincing.

IV

The next group of suggestions has in common that they all seek to explain our phrase on the basis of Ugaritic and indeed, with the exception of the first proposal to be considered (that of Reider), they all explicitly build upon one another.

Reider's discussion (see n. 15 above) is the earliest example known to me of the use of evidence from Ugarit to elucidate this verse, and even then it is only part of his argument. Appealing to the Amarna tablets and to Qatabanian as well as to Ugaritic, he postulates a Hebrew root *skn* meaning "to keep, to guard, to care for". He therefore vocalizes the first word as *hamm^esakkēn* and renders the phrase "the keeper of sacred contributions"⁽²²⁾. Reider's proposal does not explain why *t^erûmâ* is in the singular, however, and he himself seems to have recognized that his translation did not give good sense in the overall context. His concluding remark effectively eliminates the need for further discussion: "It must be admitted that since verse 20 is too circumstantial and expository it is not impossible that it constitutes a later gloss or comment on the preceding verse".

Far more influential has been the suggestion of Gray⁽²³⁾, who appeals to the Ugaritic noun *skn* meaning something "set up", "a stele". He thus revocalizes the first word as a pi'el participle of this root (*ham^esakkēn*) and reverts to the emendation of *t^erûmâ* to *t^emû-nâ* to arrive at a translation "he who would set up an image". He

⁽²²⁾ This is not unlike one of the suggestions of Ibn Ezra, who compares *sōkēn* at Isa 22,15 and so proposes "the treasurer of the oblation"; cf. M. FRIEDLÄNDER, *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah* (London 1873) I, 177.

⁽²³⁾ J. GRAY, *The Legacy of Canaan. The Ras Shamra Texts and their Relevance to the Old Testament* (SVT 5; Leiden 1957) 192, (1965) 262-263. Apart from the explicit developments of Gray's theory noted below, a considerable number of recent studies have adopted this theory in one or other of its forms.

believes that this is what lay behind the LXX's translation, noted above. This view was later defended by Schoors⁽²⁴⁾ against Trudinger's criticism. Trudinger objected that since Gray had referred only to the noun *skn*, "the evidence for the currency of the verb *skn* 'to set up' is exiguous". Schoors countered with a discussion of passages which he believed showed that alongside the noun *skn*, Ugaritic also had a verb of the same root meaning "to make a statue or an image, to form".

Finally, Mettinger⁽²⁵⁾ has taken up this suggestion of Gray and Schoors but he has developed it a good deal further. First, he retains the Masoretic vocalization of *ham'sukkân*, construing it as an interrogative *hē* with the pu'al participle of this same verb *skn*, meaning "a thing formed", hence "an image". He suggests that it may have been this word which the LXX rendered ὁμοίωμα⁽²⁶⁾. Second, Mettinger accepts, broadly speaking, that **rûmâ* has its normal sense of "contribution for sacred uses", but he wishes to follow Elliger in defining this more narrowly as something that one is required to give rather than as an offering dedicated of one's own free will. He therefore translates, "Maybe an image, which is a prescribed offering". He thus finds an ironic twist in the verse: "The most natural thing would have been to deliver the most precious image, of the kind described in v. 19, to the temple, but says the prophet, this is precisely what is not done. Instead one chooses the less expensive way of making an idol of wood. For the idol which is to be dedicated as a sacred contribution one is content with the minimum requirement that it will not fall, *pæsaē lo' yimmôṭ* (v. 20c). The listeners are not good practicers of their religion, says the prophet. Their own actions testify to the nothingness of their gods".

The merits of Mettinger's proposal are obvious: he avoids the need for any emendation, and a strong part of his argument is the

(24) A. SCHOORS, "Two Notes on Isaiah xl-lv", *VT* 21 (1971) 501-505; see also his *I am God your Saviour. A Form-Critical Study of the Main Genres in Is. xl-lv* (SVT 24; Leiden 1973) 253-255.

(25) T. N. D. METTINGER, "The Elimination of a Crux? A Syntactic and Semantic Study of Isaiah xl 18-20", *Studies on Prophecy* (SVT 26; Leiden 1974) 77-83.

(26) Mettinger appeals to E. JENNI, *Das hebräische Pi'el* (Zürich 1968) to explain why the pu'al was used in preference to the passive of the qal.

fact that he brings the opening of verses 19 and 20 into a parallel relationship. However, these advantages must be weighed against three difficulties. First, Mettinger re-introduces a contrast between the two verses in terms of the value of the idols in question, and that in a way which is fundamental to the passage's rhetoric as he understands it. Although this is achieved without reference to "the poor man", the underlying problems noted above to the traditional English versions are applicable also in this case. Secondly, Mettinger's understanding of *ʾrûmâ* and of its function in this verse is very subtle — over-subtle, some might think. Even if Elliger (pp. 77-78) were right in his argument that it means a required offering, the fact of its being required is not the major emphasis in the majority of its uses. It is thus very doubtful whether anyone reading Isa 40,20 would have put such an emphasis on the word, even though Mettinger's exegesis depends upon it. After all, at Ezra 8,25 it appears to be used completely interchangeably with *nēdābâ*, "free-will offering", three verses later.

The third difficulty on Mettinger's view is one which also confronts Gray and Schoors, but for which none of them offers any explanation. They are obliged to postulate that a word attested only in Ugaritic, many centuries before Deutero-Isaiah, continued to exist in biblical Hebrew, only to surface at the literary level in the exile. Undoubtedly, such a phenomenon is possible. What renders it problematic in the present instance is that (i) Hebrew has no shortage of synonyms for "image, idol". It is thus a surprising word to survive only as a hapax legomenon; it is not as though it is a word of specialized or localized usage which might account for its restricted attestation. (ii) As a word used, apparently, in the Canaanite cult, it might have been expected to occur in some of the passages in the Deuteronomic literature that deal with the destruction of Canaanite cult centres. (iii) The word as it is used here is not itself attested in Ugaritic, only the root from which these scholars derive their explanation.

V

We come finally to an approach to the problems of Isa 40,20 by way of the suggestion that *mesukkān* is the name of some kind of a tree. This approach too has a long history, for it is attested by Jerome who probably derived it in turn from an even earlier tradi-

tion of Jewish interpretation⁽²⁷⁾. In his commentary on Isaiah he writes, "in Hebraeo dicitur amsuchan; quod genus ligni est imputribile, quo vel maxime idola fiunt"⁽²⁸⁾. We next find this same tradition in the Targum with its 'ôrân bārê, "he cuts, shapes a pine, fir tree"⁽²⁹⁾, and it is also found in Sa'adya, who identified the tree as an oak⁽³⁰⁾.

In more recent times this interpretation was revived by Zimmern in 1894⁽³¹⁾, since when discussion has centred chiefly around achieving a more accurate definition of the tree in question. It has, of course, been the discovery of the word's cognate in Akkadian which has fired and sustained the debate. Zimmern himself (who was the first to draw attention to the relevance of Akkadian *musukkânû*) thought it meant "palm". Campbell Thompson, however, identified the tree as mulberry⁽³²⁾, and this conclusion was applied to our verse by Smith⁽³³⁾.

It is presumably on the basis of these authorities that "mulberry" comes to be included in the New English Bible, which translates, "Or is it mulberry-wood that will not rot which a man chooses...". This rendering, however, immediately comes under suspicion because *ʾrûmâ* is read as *ʾrîmâ* and then transposed completely conjecturally to the end of v. 19:

"Is it an image which a craftsman sets up, and a goldsmith covers with plate and fits with studs of silver as a costly gift? Or is it mulberry-wood that will not rot which a man chooses?..."⁽³⁴⁾.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. F. STUMMER, "Spuren jüdischer und christlicher Einflüsse auf die Uebersetzung der grossen Propheten durch Hieronymus", *JPOS* 8 (1928) 35-48, with discussion of Isa 40,20 on pp. 37-38.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. CChr, *Series Latina* lxxiii (Turnhout 1963) 462.

⁽²⁹⁾ See conveniently J.F. STENNING, *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford 1949) 132-133.

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf. J. AND H. DERENBOURG, *Version arabe d'Isaïe de R. Saadia ben Josef al-Fayyôûmî, publiée avec des notes hébraïques et une traduction française d'après l'arabe = Œuvres complètes de R. Saadia ben Josef al Fayyôûmî* III (Paris 1896) 70.

⁽³¹⁾ H. ZIMMERN, "mêsukkân Jes. 40,20 = ass. *musukkânû* 'Palme'", *ZA* 9 (1894) 111-112.

⁽³²⁾ R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON, *The Assyrian Herbal* (London 1924) 181-182. He links it with Greek σικαμίνος, "mulberry", though this is clearly not decisive.

⁽³³⁾ SMITH, *Isaiah Chapters xl-lv*, 171-172.

⁽³⁴⁾ Cf. L. H. BROCKINGTON, *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*.

It is regrettable that the translators of the NEB were apparently unaware of the definitive discussion of *musukkannu* by Gershevitch⁽³⁵⁾. He observes that the wood occurs in an inscription of Darius from Susa as the Akkadian equivalent of Old Persian *yakā*- and that it refers to a material used in the building of the palace. While travelling in the region of Beshā kard, Gershevitch found that in the modern dialects of the region the equivalent for OP *yakā*- (namely *ĵag* and *ĵax*) was applied to a tall species of tree which was subsequently established from specimens taken as *Dalbergia sissoo* Roxb., an extremely durable wood used in the construction of buildings and furniture.

Gershevitch does not refer to our verse in the course of his article, but his conclusions have been applied to it in a brief note, not widely known, by Millard and Snook⁽³⁶⁾. They also allude to the use of sissoo as an item of tribute in ancient times. They have greater difficulty, however, in accounting for *terûmâ*. Assuming that vv. 19-20 describe only one idol, and noting that *terûmâ* "basically denotes something raised or made high", they think that "it might be a suitable word for a plinth or podium". With commendable caution, they thus propose the translation, "One chooses *sissoo*, an unrotting wood, for the base...". This latter part of their discussion is unsatisfactory. Apart from the questionable appeal to the "root meaning" of *terûmâ*, a base, plinth or podium can hardly be said to be "raised or made high". We expect a noun of this formation to have a passive meaning (cf. GK § 84^a *m*). Although this is not an invariable rule (cf. *yāqûš*, "fowler"), it is better not to appeal to exceptional formations in the explication of an obscurity.

The Readings adopted by the Translators of the New English Bible (Oxford and Cambridge 1973) 189.

(³⁵) I. GERSHEVITCH, "Sissoo at Susa", *BSOAS* 19 (1957) 317-320. Gershevitch lists the following attempts at an identification by a variety of scholars: acacia nilotica; oak; afghan cypress; teak; timber (in general) and ebony, as well as mulberry. I am grateful to Mr J. V. Kinnier Wilson for drawing my attention to the most recent collection of evidence relating to the use and geographical distribution of this tree in both ancient and modern times: K. R. MAXWELL-HYSLOP, "*Dalbergia Sissoo* Roxburgh", *Anatolian Studies* 33 (1983) 67-72.

(³⁶) A. R. MILLARD and I. R. SNOOK, "Isaiah 40:20, Towards a Solution", *The Tyndale House Bulletin* 14 (1964) 12-13.

VI

Now that the five main approaches to Isa 40,20 have been analysed, we are in a position to move forwards by drawing out from the discussion those elements which are free of the difficulties which have been noted, adding some further considerations which have either been overlooked entirely or given insufficient weight, and to see whether the result is convincing or not.

(a) We have found good reason to believe that two separate idols are being described in vv. 19-20, though the distinction between them is not to be drawn on the basis of their value. Those who think of only one idol either imply that the work of overlaying was done before the choice of the wooden core, which is absurd, or that *ṛûmâ* means "base" or the like, for which there is no evidence other than the questionable method of an appeal to a root meaning which in itself is not entirely appropriate.

(b) There are impressive formal parallels between vv. 19 and 20. Mettinger has argued well for this with regard to the opening of each verse, suggesting that they begin in each case with the interrogative *hē*. This possibility is raised by several of the versions for v. 19 (LXX - *mē*; Vg - *numquid*; Tg is ambiguous: *hā* can be used to introduce a question, but it can also be the demonstrative pronoun, "here [is]"). Whilst gemination of the consonant following the interrogative is unusual, it is by no means impossible; cf. *hayyîtab* at Lev 10,19, cited by GK §100 k. No difficulty confronts the proposal that the first letter of v. 20 is the interrogative. The two verses may thus be related in terms of "whether... or" in answer to the question in v. 18 (cf. Num 13,18 for this double use of the interrogative *hē*)(³⁷).

Similarly, I regard it as possible (though admittedly not certain) that the ending of each verse is also parallel. This possibility is not considered by Mettinger because like Jerome before him, he wishes to translate the hapax legomenon *ṛetuqôṭ* by "plates". This he does

(³⁷) Some other examples of "Doppelfragen" in Deutero-Isaiah are collected by L. KÖHLER, *Deuterocesaja (Jesaja 40-55) stilkritisch untersucht* (BZAW 37; Giessen 1923) 63 §19, though none furnishes an exact parallel to the construction proposed here.

on the basis of Mishnaic Hebrew *rtq* “to knock”, the passive participle of which might mean something beaten out, hence (silver) “plates”. Against this, however, it should be observed that this meaning for the verb in Mishnaic Hebrew is linked with the fist. *rtq* itself means “to join”, whence comes the noun *martôqā*, “knuckle, fist”, and hence the secondary verbal meaning of “to beat/knock with the fist or knuckles”, such as knocking at the door. It is improbable that as early as Deutero-Isaiah this should have shifted semantically towards the idea of beating out metal.

Compared with this view of Mettinger, the traditional approach is preferable. At Nah 3,10 *rtq* clearly has some such meaning as “to bind”, *rtw/yqwt zāhāb* are generally agreed to be gold chains at 1 Kgs 6,21, *rattôq* is traditionally taken as “chain” at Ezek 7,23, whilst in post-biblical Hebrew *ritqā* means “chain-like fence”. It is thus not surprising that Tg should have translated *rtuqôt* at Isa 40,19 by *šêšlān*, “chains”⁽³⁸⁾.

The precise nature and function of the *rtuqôt* are less easy to determine, however. North and others think of a fence round the image to prevent theft, rather like an ornamental chain round a war-memorial. Naturally, in a sarcastically polemical context, it will matter little if in fact such chains were only ornamental. 1 Kgs 6,21 might be taken to support such a view. Usually, commentators have imagined that these were chains to hold the image up. A third possibility, also compatible with the root *rtq*, is that of Smith, who translates the line “smelting bonds of silver” with the added comment, “that is pouring molten silver alloy into sockets to hold the figure upright” (p. 171).

There are several unknown factors which preclude certainty over this issue. In addition to the problem of achieving a precise translation (chain? bond?), we do not know the size of the image, which is an important material consideration: the usual view might not be so suitable for a statuette. Nor is it clear to what extent pedantic matters of fact should be allowed to influence a polemical statement. The objection has been raised, for instance, that silver is not an

⁽³⁸⁾ *h̄šūqīm* and *m̄h̄šūqīm* at Exod 27,10 and 17 etc. may provide a parallel nominal formation within a comparable semantic field from *h̄šq*, “to be attached”. There are, however, difficulties of precise interpretation in these passages not at all unlike those at Isa 40,19, so that it would be hazardous to do more than draw attention to this possible parallel.

appropriate metal for the tasks envisaged. This, however, may be the whole point, for much of Deutero-Isaiah's polemic against idols is conducted precisely in terms of the absurdity of the enterprise (see especially 44,9-20). Without doubt, an important part of the polemic concerns the idol's immovability, as 41,7, as well as 40,20, makes especially clear; it is therefore likely that such an emphasis is also present at the end of 40,19, even though uncertainty remains as to detail. In that case, 40,19 and 20 will have parallel endings in terms of their sarcastic references to the idol's immovability⁽³⁹⁾.

(c) If we now take further this parallel between the two verses suggested by their opening and ending, we can see that each one comprises three half lines, and that each is of regular metre except the first half line of v. 20. Remarkably, the question of metre has hardly been raised at all in discussion of this verse⁽⁴⁰⁾. It is hard to avoid the strong suspicion that the line is overloaded, however. But in what way? Some scholars, for instance, regard the first word or two words as a gloss. Thus North conjectures that *ham^esukkān* is a gloss on 'ēš; "the word," he writes, "cries out to be glossed". He then goes on to propose that *ṭrūmā* is either an attempt to explain *mesukkān* ("poor"), or a secondary gloss on 'ēš or *ham^esukkān* and as such is perhaps a mangling of *timōrā*, "palm". Similarly, in the context of a discussion of the phenomenon of glosses in the OT as a whole, Driver⁽⁴¹⁾ indicated that he regarded the first word in this way and so translated, "He chooseth as an offering a tree that will not rot — 'is it a mulberry?'". This, however, seems to me to be a clear — and literal — case of not seeing the wood for the trees! To gloss the self-evident by the unintelligible is inverted. I propose that it is rather the phrase 'ēš lō' *yirqab* which should be regarded as a

⁽³⁹⁾ Further support for this suggestion comes from the fact than an identical parallelism of structure may be found in another passage of idol-polemic, 44,12-13. The opening of each verse (regardless of other difficulties!) refers to *ḥāraš barzel* (an ironsmith) and *ḥāraš 'ēšīm* (carpenter) respectively, whilst each verse ends on a note of sarcasm: *wayyī' āp*, "and he grows faint" (v. 12) and *lāšebet bāyit*, "to dwell in a house" (v. 13). The sarcastic force of the latter is apparent from Isa 66,1.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ KÖHLER, *Deuterocesaja*, 7-8, manages to restore a satisfactory metre to the passage only by omitting *ham^esukkān ṭrūmā* "mit Vulgata" (though cf. § I above) and by conjecturally transferring 41,6-7 to follow 40,19a.

⁽⁴¹⁾ G. R. DRIVER, "Glosses in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament", *Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia* 1 (1957) 123-161 (129).

gloss on the opening words of the verse⁽⁴²⁾. Their removal restores the metre which other considerations have led us to expect.

(d) If this is right, then the gloss restores an all-important clue to the correct interpretation of *hamēsukkân*. It demonstrates that the tradition of interpretation formerly attested only as early as Jerome in fact goes back to a time well prior to the LXX translation, since it is there accepted as part of the text; it therefore probably reaches back to a time quite close to that of the original composition itself⁽⁴³⁾. That being so, there can no longer be any doubt that *mēsukkân* indeed refers to “a tree which does not rot”, which comparison with Akkadian *musukkannu* shows to be sissou. Indeed, the correspondence in spelling may be even closer than is generally realized, for both *AHW*, 678, and *CAD* 10, Part II, 239, list the variant vocalization *me-suk-kan-nu* for the neo-Babylonian period.

(e) There remains only the question of *terûmâ*. We noted earlier that Driver once linked this word with Akkadian *tarîmtu*. More recently, in a discussion of the word in Hebrew which does not refer to this passage (see above, n. 12), he has argued more for the meaning “levy”. *AHW*, 1329, suggests the meaning “Geschenkgegenstand” for *tarîmtu(m)*, whilst in a separate article von Soden had previously linked this word with Hebrew *terûmâ*⁽⁴⁴⁾ and speculated

⁽⁴²⁾ After completing the outline of this article, I discovered that E. LIPIŃSKI also treats this phrase as a gloss; cf. “SKN et SGN dans le sémitique occidental du nord”, *UF* 5 (1973) 191-207 (206). It is merely stated as an opinion, however, without the necessary argumentation in its favour which is attempted here. P. HAUPT, “*Mēsukkân*, Acacia Nilotica”, *JBL* 36 (1917) 145-146, suggests that the phrase is “an additional explanatory gloss to *mēsukkân*” following “the tertiary gloss *tîmôrâ*, post” (Haupt’s emendation of *terûmâ*). While Haupt’s suggestion thus has some close points of contact with ours, his view that verses 19-20 developed as a whole series of explanatory glosses on v. 18, together with other emendations which he proposes, results in a very different understanding of the passage as a whole to that defended above. I have also been amused to note that T. K. CHEYNE rejected the possibility of regarding this phrase as a gloss because to do so “spoils the structure of the verse”; cf. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (SBOT 10; Leipzig, Baltimore and London 1899) 129.

⁽⁴³⁾ M. ELLENBOGEN, *Foreign Words in the Old Testament: their Origin and Etymology* (London 1962) 106-107, makes a similar point by referring to ‘ēṣ lō’ *yirqab* as “the parallel”. However, he fails to explain how he would analyse the structure of the verse on this premise.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ W. VON SODEN, “*Mirjām*-Maria ‘(Gottes-) Geschenk’”, *UF* 2 (1970) 269-272.

that it meant "Geschenk". By contrast, at Prov 29,4, 'iš *terûmôt* should perhaps be taken to mean "a man who levies taxes"⁽⁴⁵⁾ or "forced contributions" (NEB). In a context such as the present one, "levy" or "gift" fits admirably, for, as the lexicons show, there are plenty of examples of sissoo being used as an item of tribute. The initial *hē* of *ham^ssukkān* is to be taken as the interrogative and the rest of the word pointed as a construct before *terûmâ* (*m^ssukkan*)⁽⁴⁶⁾. Whether as "sissoo of, i.e. fit for, tribute" or "a gift", the intention in each case will be the same, namely to emphasize its value. Man may produce an idol of the choicest of wood, but his handiwork may still not legitimately be compared with God.

(f) One of the attractions of the traditional translation of this verse is that *ham^ssukkān* serves as the subject of *yibhār*. This is not a strong objection to our understanding, however, for the verb can equally well have an indefinite subject (cf. GK § 144*d*).

The whole passage, verses 18-20, may then be translated:
To whom will you liken God, or what likeness will you set alongside him?

An idol, perhaps? — one which a workman casts and a goldsmith overlays with gold,
casting silver chains (?) for it.

Or someone may choose sissoo that is fit for tribute; he seeks out a skilful craftsman
to set up an image that will not fall.

VII

Reflection on this discussion prompts three general consequences which themselves help to reinforce the conclusions reached.

(a) On the assumption that the proposed solution is correct, we

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Cf. W. MCKANE, *Proverbs: a New Approach* (London 1970) 256 and 638.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ The vocalization with *qāmeš* rather than *pataḥ* will have arisen once it was no longer realized that the initial *hē* is interrogative, not the definite article. It is of interest to note, however, that C. D. GINSBURG, *The Later Prophets* (London 1926) 52, lists fourteen manuscripts which vocalize with *pataḥ*. The alternative vocalization *m^ssukkān* in the Aleppo Codex (cf. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, *The Book of Isaiah*, 177), however, does not seem to be of significance to the present discussion.

may note again the importance of early Jewish interpretation for the understanding of difficult passages in the Hebrew Bible. Attention has been drawn to the fact that several modern proposals had already been anticipated by one or other of the rabbinic commentators. The tradition we have favoured, however, is attested not only by Sa'adya and so obvious an earlier source as the Targum, but even by the Masoretic vocalization itself. As noted above, the tradition was evidently strong enough to resist the pressure to assimilate *ham'sukkān* to the (to us) more "obvious" *hammiskēn* or the like.

(b) The isolation of *'ēš lō'yirqab* as a gloss is witness to an early awareness that the meaning of what is no more than the transliteration of a foreign word might easily be forgotten. Those who preserved the text in the early days evidently took steps sometimes to ensure its correct interpretation, and comparable examples of this could easily be cited. This suggests once more the need for caution in seeking explanations of items of vocabulary for which there is no hint in tradition. Sometimes, of course, we have no alternative, but we should be wary of pressing the method to the point at which it becomes necessary to postulate that the text's import was quickly forgotten by those who handed it down.

(c) Finally, whereas appeal has been made to comparative philology in order to interpret a hapax legomenon, the evidence used has come from the language and the period most closely associated with the setting which is generally, and in my view rightly, presupposed for this author. This is a refinement of what Barr has labelled "area preferences within comparative philology"⁽⁴⁷⁾, an axiom that cannot be pressed rigidly but which nevertheless perhaps deserves fuller recognition than has often been the case.

Faculty of Oriental Studies
University of Cambridge
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge CB3 9DA

H. G. M. WILLIAMSON

⁽⁴⁷⁾ J. BARR, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1968) 111-114.

SOMMAIRE

Les discussions antérieures sur les deux premiers mots d'Is 40,20 sont classées en cinq groupes et leurs forces et faiblesses sont évaluées. On suggère alors, sur la base d'une comparaison de la structure des vv. 19 et 20, que les mots 'ēš lō' *yirqab*, «un arbre qui ne pourrira pas», sont une glose qui indique correctement la compréhension de *mesukkān* comme «sissoo». A la lumière de l'accadien, *terûmâ* doit être traduit «tribut», en sorte qu'Is 40,20a soit rendu par «ou quelqu'un peut choisir sissoo qui convient comme tribut».

The Oracles Against the Israelite Dynasties in 1 and 2 Kings

The importance of the prophetic role in the Deuteronomistic History's (Dtr) account of the divided kingdoms should not be underestimated⁽¹⁾. In the books of Kings in general there are some forty instances where a prophet or prophetess plays a part in the narrative or delivers a message from Yahweh. The majority of these pertain to the progress and eventual demise of the northern kingdom, Israel.

One major sequence of prophetic stories and oracles concerns the rise and fall of the individual dynasties of Israel. In 1 Kgs 11,29-39 Jeroboam is granted kingship over the ten northern tribes and is promised a "stable house" if he is obedient to all Yahweh's commands (v. 38) but in 1 Kgs 14,1-18 we read of the condemnation of both Jeroboam and his dynasty. 1 Kgs 15,33-16,7 and 21,17-24 contain similar condemnations of Baasha and Ahab and their dynasties respectively. When Jehu is anointed (2 Kgs 9,1-14) he is directed to eliminate the dynasty of Ahab. Thus the first three dynasties of Israel fall. Jehu's dynasty is not condemned in the same way but is given a limited existence by Yahweh himself (2 Kgs 10,30). After this last dynasty we have a series of five kings (2 Kgs 15,13-17,4), four of whom usurp the throne. Only Menachim manages to establish his son, Pekahiah, on the throne (2 Kgs 15,21-24) but this succession collapses after two years. No prophetic activity is mentioned in this final period.

This paper analyses closely the above sequence of prophetic material. Particular consideration is given to the similarity of language

(1) G. VON RAD has discussed this in his essay "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings", *Studies in Deuteronomy* (London 1953) 74-92, esp. 78-81. There he points to a sequence of prophetic oracles and the records of their fulfilment which point to the power of the word of Yahweh and the control over the history of the nation by the deity.

and style and the unity of the oracles of condemnation (1 Kgs 14,7-11; 16,2-4; 21,20-24 and 2 Kgs 9,6-10). The place of this material within the context of Dtr is studied with regard to its relation to the initial Ahijah oracle to Jeroboam (1 Kgs 11,29-39), the prophetic story of 1 Kings 13 and the major Dtr passage on the fall of Israel (2 Kgs 17,1-23).

1 Kgs 14,1-18

In this episode Jeroboam sends his wife in disguise to seek a word from Ahijah about their sick child, only to hear of the condemnation of his dynasty. As is well known the major Greek witnesses differ dramatically from the MT in both content and order at this point. 1 Kgs 14,1-20 is absent from GB (Vaticanus) and other versions including most of the Lucianic ones. Several verses referred to as 3 Reg 12,24a-z, giving a second account of the rise of Jeroboam and telling of the revolt of Israel, appear earlier in the Greek versions. 3 Reg 12,24g-n refer to the journey of Jeroboam's wife to Ahijah and to the prophet's oracle. Due to the marked dissimilarities between the MT version and that of the Greek witnesses we will deal with the two accounts separately.

In MT, 1 Kgs 14,1 clearly begins a new unit with the introductory formula, "at that time", and new subject matter. The domestic scene with Jeroboam, his wife and child is developed through to v. 6. The subject of these verses is the seeking of the prophet's word about the boy's health. The disguise of Jeroboam's wife (mentioned in vv. 2, 5 and 6) and the prophet's blindness heighten the drama of the story and emphasize the fact that Yahweh's word is not subject to human manipulation or weakness.

This story breaks off at v. 7 and takes up again in v. 12 with Ahijah addressing Jeroboam's wife. The words *bw'*, *hlk* and *qwm*, used several times in vv. 1-6, occur here again in connection with the motifs of entering the house/door/city and of the (sound of) the footsteps of Jeroboam's wife. The point at which her disguise is undone in v. 6 parallels the point at which the boy will die. The conclusion to the story is in vv. 17-18a. The woman does precisely as directed by Ahijah in v. 12. The boy dies and the prophet's word is fulfilled.

Vv. 7-11 show marked dissimilarities to this story both in terms of content and style. First, the speech in these verses is a message

from Yahweh to Jeroboam concerning his behaviour and the future of his dynasty. There is no reference to the wife or the sick boy. While Jeroboam is a peripheral character in vv. 1-6.12.17 and 18a, in vv. 7-11 he is in center stage. His activity and future dynasty are in question. Secondly, vv. 7-11 fit awkwardly into the general flow of the story. V. 7 begins with a directive to Jeroboam's wife, "Go, say to Jeroboam" followed by the usual opening messenger formula. This fits well with the story thus far, but v. 11 ends with another messenger formula, "This, Yahweh has spoken" followed by a second directive to Jeroboam's wife "as for you, get up and go". Thirdly, and most significant, is the proliferation of Dtr language in vv. 7-11 compared to its marked absence in vv. 1-6 etc.⁽²⁾. Dtr language and style are also evident in vv. 13aβ-16⁽³⁾.

The above arguments suggest that in 1 Kgs 14,1-18 we have a prophetic story, vv. 1-6.12.17 and 18a, which tells of the seeking of a prophetic word⁽⁴⁾, and where Yahweh's word is the focus of attention⁽⁵⁾. Its association with Jeroboam and Ahijah allows it to fit into the Jeroboam cycle in 1 Kings. Here it is given new significance. The death of the boy is associated with the demise of the

⁽²⁾ E.g. *hālak 'ahāray* (v. 8, cf. Deut 13,5; 2 Kgs 23,3); *bēkol-lēbābō* (v. 8, cf. 1 Sam 7,3; 12,20.24; 1 Kgs 8,23; 2 Kgs 10,31); *k's* (various forms; v. 9, cf. 1 Kgs 15,30; 16,13.26.33; 22,53-54; 2 Kgs 17,11.17; 21,6; 23,26); *hinēni mēbi' rā'ā 'al* (v. 10; cf. 1 Kgs 9,9; 21,29; 2 Kgs 21,12; 22,16.20); *šamar mišwōtay* (v. 8; cf. twenty-three times in Deuteronomy; Josh 22,5; 1 Kgs 2,3; 3,14; 11,34.38 etc.); *la'āsōt raq hayyāšār bē'ēnāy* (v. 8; cf. Deut 6,18; 12,25.28; 1 Kgs 11,33.38; 15,5,11; 22,43 etc.); *wā'egra' 'et-hammamlākā mibbēt dāwīd* (v. 8; cf. 1 Kgs 11,11.13.31; 2 Kgs 17,21). A more extensive list of Dtr expressions is treated in W. DIETRICH, *Prophetie und Geschichte* (Göttingen 1972) 82-93. Also see Appendix A of M. WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford 1972) 320-359.

⁽³⁾ E.g. *hā'ādāmā haṭṭōbā* (Deut 1,35; 3,25 etc. and in Josh 23,13.15.16); *wēhikkā yhw'y 'et-yiśrā'el... wēnātaš 'et-yiśrā'el mē'al...* (Deut 29,27, cf. Deut 28,21.63; Josh 23,13-16 etc.); and *ūbēḥaṭṭā(')tō 'āšer heḥēti 'et-yiśrā'el* (1 Kgs 15,27; 16,26 etc.).

⁽⁴⁾ While a full form-critical analysis of this story is not of primary concern here it can be noted that it has several affinities with A. ROFE's "didactic *legenda*", ("Classes in the Prophetic Stories", *VTS* 26 [1974] 143-164, esp. 153). It has little room for the magic of the simple *legenda* (e.g. 1 Kgs 17,8-16) and gives more emphasis to God's intervention in the natural order.

⁽⁵⁾ In many ways Ahijah is regarded as, and acts like, a seer and parallels the image of Samuel given by Saul and his servant in 1 Sam 9,5-10.

dynasty. This is done by placing the story after the editorial comments of 1 Kgs 13,34 and by including oracles concerning the end of the dynasty and the eventual fall of Israel (vv. 7-11.13a β -16). Unlike the prophecy in the story about the boy, which is fulfilled within the unit, the fulfilment of these oracles comes only in later editorial work (1 Kgs 15,27 and 2 Kings 17).

The position of some elements in the narrative remains uncertain. The status of v. 13 has long been debated. Noth⁽⁶⁾ and Gray⁽⁷⁾ include it as part of the prophetic story. As we have noted, however, the main theme of this narrative concerns only Jeroboam's son, not his dynasty. V. 13a β -b is better read as an editorial attempt to harmonize the burial of Jeroboam's son with the curse of v. 11⁽⁸⁾. V. 13a α , on the other hand, should probably be connected with the prophetic story on the basis of the parallels between vv. 12-13a α and 17-18a. M. Noth also regards v. 2b as a Deuteronomic note⁽⁹⁾. Others freely include it with v. 16. The case here is debatable.

A few remarks should be made about the structure of the oracle of condemnation in vv. 7-11. It begins with *ya'an 'ăšer*, "because", which governs a long chain of causal clauses (vv. 7-9). Yahweh states what he has done for Jeroboam (vv. 7a β -8a) and then recalls the sins of Jeroboam (vv. 8b-9) since his initial action. This sequence forms the basis for the divine declaration in v. 10. It begins with the non-verbal clause (*hinēnī mēbī' rā'ā*, "I will bring evil") followed by converted perfects. This sequence is introduced by *lāk-ēn*, "therefore". V. 11 follows with the curse, the significance of which will be discussed later. Parallelism within the curse gives it a poetic quality and the totality of the destruction is emphasized by the use of two merisms in alternate lines ("city-field" and "dogs-birds").

3 Reg 12,24g-n

The episode of Jeroboam's sick boy and the enquiry to the prophet is recorded in the major Greek witnesses within a larger narra-

⁽⁶⁾ M. NOTH, *Könige I. 1-16* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968) 311.

⁽⁷⁾ J. GRAY, *I and II Kings* (rev.ed.; Philadelphia 1970) 333-334.

⁽⁸⁾ So too WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy*, 23-24.

⁽⁹⁾ NOTH, *Könige*, 310.

tive, 3 Reg 12,24a-z. The most frequently discussed aspect of this passage has been the account of Jeroboam's rise to power (v. 24b-f) and its comparison with the earlier account in 3 Reg 11,26-12,24. D.W. Gooding argues that the first account (11,26-12,24) has "attempted to whitewash Jeroboam by modelling his behaviour after King David's"⁽¹⁰⁾ while the second account (3 Reg 12,24a-z) is an attempt to vilify Jeroboam⁽¹¹⁾. The two Septuagint versions are "excellent early examples of (Rabbinic) homiletic principles"⁽¹²⁾. With the MT account they form an "original story plus two Rabbinic, homiletic variations"⁽¹³⁾. Just when the interpretation of the narrative in MT 1 Kgs 14,1-18 took place, Gooding does not conclude. It could have been that some reinterpretation was already present in the *Vorlage* of the Greek. Alternatively the original translators could have used a text similar to the MT with later revision on the basis of a Hebrew text not the same as the MT. At any rate Gooding argues that further reinterpretation has taken place with the Greek text⁽¹⁴⁾.

R. W. Klein and J. D. Shenkel have argued for a different perspective on the Greek texts⁽¹⁵⁾. Shenkel's argument, while addressing itself principally to matters of chronology, is relevant here. In part he concludes:

Viewed from the perspective of the historical development of the Greek text, it is now evident that the Old Greek chronology, far from being the artificial contrivance

⁽¹⁰⁾ D. W. GOODING, "The Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise to Power", *VT* 17 (1967) 173-189, esp. 198. See also his "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns", *Textus* 7 (1969) 1-29, esp. 2-13.

⁽¹¹⁾ GOODING, "Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise", 187-188.

⁽¹²⁾ GOODING, "Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise", 188.

⁽¹³⁾ GOODING, "Septuagint's Rival Versions of Jeroboam's Rise", 189.

⁽¹⁴⁾ GOODING, "Problems of Text and Midrash", 17-29.

⁽¹⁵⁾ R. W. KLEIN, "Jeroboam's Rise to Power", *JBL* 89 (1970) 217-218. See in relation to this D. W. GOODING, "Jeroboam's Rise to Power: A Rejoinder", *JBL* 91 (1972) 529-533; J. D. SHENKEL, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM. 1; Cambridge, Mass. 1968). See also M. ABERBACH and L. SMOLAR, "Jeroboam's Rise to Power", *JBL* 88 (1969) 69-72.

of late scribal activity, was the earliest chronology in the Greek textual tradition and was already present in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the earliest translation of the Books of Kings⁽¹⁶⁾.

Shenkel's argument raises the distinct possibility that 3 Reg 12,24a-z could be a genuine variant of a Hebrew text not necessarily a late Rabbinic, homiletic variant of the Hebrew text witnessed in the MT. Gooding criticizes Shenkel on several grounds but concludes in his review of Shenkel's work:

...Shenkel's understandable weakness is that he has tried to reach a definitive solution on too narrow a basis; his virtue is that he has produced a working hypothesis that will prove a great stimulus in the quest for the final answers⁽¹⁷⁾.

The story of Jeroboam's sick son in 3 Reg 12,24g-n has some noticeable differences to the narrative found in MT 1 Kgs 14,1-18. Many of these are matters of detail. For example, in the Greek text there are references to the seriousness of the illness of the boy (v. 24g), Ahijah's servant (v. 24k), Jeroboam's wife's name is given (v. 24g) and her maidservants are mentioned (v. 24l). None of these is found in MT. On the other hand MT alone has reference to the number of loaves taken to Ahijah (1 Kgs 14,3). Some elements appear in both but with differences. Jeroboam's wife returns to Tirzah in MT (v. 17) but to Sarira in 3 Reg 12,24n⁽¹⁸⁾. The list of gifts taken to Ahijah (MT v. 3), while given in 3 Reg 12,24h is also reiterated in v. 24i and 24l.

Some of these variations could suggest that reworking of the Greek text has taken place vis-à-vis the MT, for example in the case of the reference to Sarira as Jeroboam's wife's home, not Tirzah as

⁽¹⁶⁾ J. D. SHENKEL, *Chronology*, 110.

⁽¹⁷⁾ D. W. GOODING, Review of J. D. SHENKEL, *Chronology*, *JTS* 21 (1970) 118-131.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Compare MT 1 Kgs 11,26 where Jeroboam's home is *šēredā*. The GB reading *Sarira* reveals a textual problem arising out of a *d/r* confusion in the Hebrew manuscripts. The editor of 3 Reg 12,24a-z has recorded Jeroboam's home town consistent with 11,26.

in MT. The Greek manuscripts bring the city name into line with that given in 11,26 while MT has Jeroboam's house at the site of the early capital of the northern kingdom. However, while this variant might have arisen through editorial activity it is unlikely that this is the case with the other variants. In the immediate context of the narrative the Greek and MT texts do not show as much variation in textual detail of the same kind. Therefore it seems that we have genuine ancient variants of the narrative as the bases of the two extant accounts. These variants would probably go back to oral sources. So even if scribal activity is evident in the Greek manuscripts in Reigns we have to reckon with the Greek tradition witnessing to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* than that behind MT, at least in the case of this narrative.

Some differences between the stories reflect differences in style and skill in the respective narrators. For example, the careful play on the motif of the footsteps in the MT account is absent in 3 Reigns. However, other variants mark editorial activity occasioned by political or theological motives. The MT version shows greater emphasis on Yahweh's control of the situation and on the power of his prophet, especially through references to the disguise of Jeroboam's wife (vv. 2,5) and to the detection of that by the blind prophet after Yahweh has warned him (vv. 5-6).

A more significant variation, and the one most relevant for our study, involves the omission from the Greek manuscripts of passages in MT in 1 Kgs 14,2b (which refers to Ahijah's earlier prophecy concerning Jeroboam's ascent to the throne of Israel), in vv. 7-9,10b (which refer to Yahweh's gift of the north to Jeroboam, his subsequent sin and Yahweh's anger), and in vv. 13a β -16 (which refer to a king who will destroy Jeroboam's dynasty and to the ultimate destruction of the north). In MT the story of Jeroboam's sick son has become the vehicle for the connection of Ahijah's prophecy in 1 Kgs 11,29-39 promising kingship to Jeroboam, Jeroboam's sin of disobedience to Yahweh especially in setting up the bulls of Dan and Bethel and of the demise of Jeroboam's dynasty and of the final destiny of the northern kingdom. 3 Reg 12,24g-n only contains the condemnation of Jeroboam's house (v. 24m). Ahijah first tells Ano of the impending death of her son and then adds "I will destroy every male who belongs to Jeroboam. Those of Jeroboam who have died and will be in the city the dogs will eat; and those of Jeroboam who have died in the field, the birds will eat". The curse is the

same as in MT 1 Kgs 14,11 although in the latter the introduction to it is elaborated in v. 10b with further definition of Jeroboam's household as both 'āṣûr wə'āzûb, possibly "bond and free", and with specific reference to the destruction of the dynasty.

We pointed out earlier the proliferation of Dtr phrases in vv. 7-11 of MT 1 Kgs 14 compared to their marked absence in vv. 1-6. It should be noted here also that 3 Reg 12,24g-n are significant for their lack of Dtr language. Even the Dtr expression *ûbi'artî 'aḥărê*, "I will consume...", in 1 Kgs 14,10b is absent from 3 Reg 12,24m⁽¹⁹⁾. The only expressions present in Ahijah's oracle in 3 Reg 12,24g-n which are characteristic of the Dtr account in MT 1 Kgs 14,1-18 are "I will destroy every male who belongs to Jeroboam" and the curse (v. 24m)⁽²⁰⁾. Both of these probably have their origins outside the Dtr historian's language. It should also be noted that MT 1 Kgs 14,13aβ-16 which condemn Jeroboam and contain several Dtr expressions, are omitted from GB and other Greek texts.

If Gooding's argument that 3 Reg 12,24a-z is a (Rabbinic) homiletic variation of an original story which seeks to vilify Jeroboam is correct, then it is curious that precisely those sections which are most savage in their attack on the king are omitted. It can only be concluded that whatever the processes involved in the development of the 3 Reigns account, the Hebrew *Vorlage* used in the earliest stages of translation contained a variant narrative, probably oral in origin, from that which underlies the present MT. In addition to this it seems evident, from the proliferation of Dtr language in those verses found in the MT account but not in the Greek, that by some unknown means the version of the narrative admitted to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek text is a survival of an account untouched by the Dtr historians.

We should also note at this stage the different structure of the oracle in 3 Reg 12,24 to that in MT 1 Kgs 14,1-18. Whereas in the MT account Ahijah's formal oracle to Jeroboam's wife begins with direct reference to Jeroboam's activity and Yahweh's condemnation

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. 1 Kgs 16,3 and 21,21 where the expression occurs elsewhere in Dtr. Both of these verses are contained in oracles against the northern dynasties.

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. 1 Kgs 16,4.11; 21,21.24; 2 Kgs 9,8; and cf. further 2 Kgs 14,26.

and only mentions the plight of the child after the curse against Jeroboam's dynasty, the account in 3 Reg 12,24 weaves its briefer condemnation of Jeroboam and his dynasty more satisfactorily into the story of the sick child. Jeroboam's wife is first told that the child will die (v. 24l) and only after this does the judgment and curse against the dynasty come. It would seem that in the 3 Reigns account the condemnation and curse against the dynasty are used to support the prophecy concerning the child while in the MT account the narrative about the child has become the vehicle for a major condemnation of the dynasty.

We have argued above that MT 1 Kgs 14,1-18 consists of a prophetic story associated with Jeroboam and Ahijah which has been given new significance by the addition of oracles (vv. 7-11,13aβ-16) with strong Dtr tendencies and the inclusion of the whole narrative after the editorial comment of 1 Kgs 13,34. Thus the destruction of Jeroboam's dynasty is connected to the establishment of cultic sites and personnel outside Jerusalem. The existence of the narrative in 3 Reg 12,24g-n, with its variant details on the story of Jeroboam's son and its omission of passages containing Dtr language, which condemn Jeroboam's dynasty, and connecting the narrative to the overall movement of the northern kingdom toward destruction, shows that this position is viable.

1 Kings 16,1-4

The second prophetic oracle against an Israelite dynasty, delivered by the prophet Jehu, is more clearly defined than the first. It is neatly framed by the Dtr opening and closing formulae for Baasha's reign (1 Kgs 15,33.34 and 16,5.6 respectively). The only other mention of Baasha is in his conspiracy against Nadab (1 Kgs 15,27-31) where the story forms the fulfilment of the oracle by Ahijah against the house of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14,7-11).

1 Kgs 16,1-4 is introduced by a prophetic formula (v. 1). Unlike the Ahijah oracle there is no introductory messenger formula but several other expressions show close resemblance to the former oracle. V. 2 begins, "Because I exalted you from the dust and made you a leader over my people Israel...". We could recall the similar statement in 1 Kgs 14,7. The hiphil infinitive of the verb *k's*, "to provoke to anger", is used to express both Baasha's and Jeroboam's sin. The clause *hinēnī mēbē'îr 'ahārē ba'sā' wē'ahārē bētô* (16,3),

"I will destroy Baasha and his dynasty", compares with *ûbi'artî 'aḥārē bêt-yārob'ām* (14,10), "I will destroy the dynasty of Jeroboam". The curse in 16,4 is almost identical to that of 14,11.

The fulfilment of the oracle comes soon after in 1 Kgs 16,11-15. This section exhibits similar language to the fulfilment of the Ahijah prophecy (1 Kgs 15,27-30). The clause *lō'-hiš'îr lô maštîn bêqîr wêgō'ālāw wêrē'ēhû*, "there will not remain to him a male, either his kinsman or his friend" (16,11), shows a close connection with the Ahijah oracle in both MT and Greek versions as well as the later Ahab oracle (1 Kgs 21,20-24). The clause in those oracles is recalled here but with an attempt at clarification. The difficult *'āšûr wê'āzûb*, "bond and free", has become the more intelligible *wêgō'ālāw wêrē'ēhû*, "either his kinsman or his friend". Several Dtr expressions also occur in the oracle⁽²¹⁾.

The structure of the oracle is similar to that of Ahijah. We have the long causal chain introduced by *ya'an 'āšer*. The causal chain is divided into two parts as in the Ahijah oracle, the statement of what Yahweh did for Baasha and the statement of Baasha's subsequent sins. Altogether these form the basis for Yahweh's action in v. 3, introduced by *hinēnî* plus participle as in 1 Kgs 14,10 and followed by the curse.

1 Kgs 21,20-24

The third oracle in the series comes at the end of the story about Naboth's vineyard. Unlike the personal condemnations of Ahab (1 Kgs 20,37-43; 22,28) this one also condemns Ahab's dynasty. In vv. 17-19 Elijah is directed by Yahweh to speak against Ahab's action concerning Naboth. Ahab is condemned for this activity with a curse mentioning Naboth and telling of Ahab's impending end (v. 19). This oracle is fulfilled in 1 Kgs 22,38. The authenticity of v. 19 has been defended by J. M. Miller⁽²²⁾ and J. Gray⁽²³⁾.

⁽²¹⁾ *hālak bēderek yārob'ām* (v. 2), cf. 1 Kgs 15,26.34; 16,19.26; 22,53 (all of Israelite kings) and 2 Kgs 8,18.27; 16,3 (all of Judean kings); various forms of *k's* (v. 2), 1 Kgs 14,9; 21,22, cf. 1 Kgs 15,30; 16,13.26.33; 22,53-54; 2 Kgs 17,11.17; 21,6; 23,26; and hiphil of *hî* (v. 2), 1 Kgs 21,22; cf. 1 Kgs 15,26.34; 16,19.26; 2 Kgs 3,3; 10,29; 21,11 etc.

⁽²²⁾ J. M. MILLER, "The Fall of the House of Ahab", *VT* 17 (1967) 313-317. Miller argues v. 19 is original as it bears two differences to 2 Kgs 9,25

In v. 20 we have a clear break. Suddenly Ahab and Elijah confront each other. The subsequent oracle of Elijah describes Ahab's sin in general terms. It extends the condemnation to the whole dynasty (vv. 21-22) and compares it to the two previous dynasties. In sharp contrast to the Naboth story, where we have no distinctly characteristic Dtr language, the oracle of Elijah presents several examples. The fulfilment of this oracle comes only in 2 Kgs 9,25-26 where Ahab's dynasty finally falls to Jehu.

The structure of the oracle is similar to that of the previous ones although some differences can be seen. There is no introductory messenger formula. The oracle begins in v. 20b with *ya'an* but only one causal clause is given. In v. 21 the divine response is introduced typically by the non-verbal clause, *hinēnī* plus participle. It provides reasons for Yahweh's action which echo those given in 1 Kgs 14,9 and 16,2. Ahab has provoked Yahweh to anger (*'el-hak-ka'as 'āšer hik'astā*) and caused Israel to sin (*wattaḥāṭī 'et-yis-rā'ēl*). The description of what Yahweh will do to the Israelite king (v. 21) also echoes those given in the oracles against Jeroboam and Baasha (1 Kgs 14,10; 16,3,11). He will bring evil upon him (*hinēnī mēbī(') 'ēlēkā rā'ā*), he will consume him (*ūbī'artī 'ahārēkā*) and he will cut off every male, "bond and free", in Israel. This last punishment is also found in 3 Reg 12,24m. Finally in this oracle, we have two curses, one against Jezebel and the general one against Ahab's house. In the latter there is a similar poetic structure to the previous curses (1 Kgs 14,11; 16,4; cf. 3 Reg 12,24m).

2 Kings 9,6-10

This fourth oracle concerns the words of the prophet sent by Elijah to anoint Jehu. The divine message given by the prophet in v. 3, "I have anointed you king over Israel", is also reported by

which recalls the curse — the mention of Naboth's sons and the reference to dogs licking the blood. If v. 19 were secondary the discrepancy would be avoided. One could also mention that the place where Ahab's blood was to be licked, Jezreel, is not the place where the fulfilment in 1 Kgs 22,38 is situated, i.e. Samaria. Surely such a discrepancy would also be avoided if v. 19 were an editorial addition.

(²³) GRAY, *Kings*, 436, points to the care in the description in 1 Kgs 22,38 as indicative that v. 19 is genuine.

Jehu to his companions in v. 12. In the actual anointing scene a longer oracle is given. In vv. 7-10a there is additional material concerning the destruction of Ahab's house and Jezebel's death. There is no mention of Jehu's reign as one might expect.

The structure found in the previous three oracles in MT 1 Kings is missing. While there is no causal clause or chain of clauses, there are many phrases similar to those in the result clauses of those previous oracles. The curse found in 1 Kgs 21,23 is repeated here. The Dtr expression "my servants the prophets" is in sharp contrast to the absence of Dtr features in the story of the prophet sent to anoint Jehu. In fact the latter story forms a complete unit with consistency of style and theme. The prophet's mission is accomplished in v. 6, and in v. 13 Jehu's companions confirm what Yahweh has already declared. In contrast to this internal unity, the fulfilment of vv. 7-10a does not come until the end of the chapter (vv. 24-37).

The Oracles Against the Israelite Dynasties

The preceding analysis has revealed four clearly defined oracles in MT 1 Kings 11-2 Kings 17 which speak of the downfall of the first three dynasties of Israel. In three cases (1 Kgs 14,7-11; 21,20-24; 2 Kgs 9,7-10a) these proclamations are inserted into other prophetic stories. Isolated royal incidents have become the framework for revealing Yahweh's judgment of and control over the Israelite dynasties. Individual royal narratives have become occasions of national significance. The fourth oracle (1 Kgs 16,2-4) stands within the editorial framework of Kings, and incorporates the reigns of Baasha and Elah into this national sequence.

The large amount of common material in the oracles has caused some scholars to argue that one oracle is the basis for the others, usually the Ahijah oracle⁽²⁴⁾. Others have seen a more complicated development⁽²⁵⁾. It seems dubious, however, to argue for the prima-

⁽²⁴⁾ NOTH, *Könige*, 345; MONTGOMERY, *Kings*, 281-282.

⁽²⁵⁾ GRAY, *Kings*, 358, argues for the existence of a "prophetic source from North Israel", possibly begun by Jehu (cf. 2 Chr 20,34) and incorporating the tradition of Ahijah. Compare H. SEEBASS, "Tradition und Interpretation bei Jehu ben Chanani und Ahia von Silo", *VT* 25 (1975) 175-190, who sees even the Ahijah oracle as a Deuteronomistic reworking of an older tradition.

cy of any one oracle over the others. The use of the common elements noted above is fluid and their order flexible. Further, the details associated with the oracles show affinities to their larger contexts⁽²⁶⁾. It seems logical, therefore, to propose that the oracles have been composed under one hand. The close associations between them are not due to literary dependency but rather to editorial intention⁽²⁷⁾. This of course does not rule out the possibility of there being some basic material which the composer has incorporated. This is quite likely as we will see. The question which follows from this concerns the origin of these oracles.

It was noted in the analysis of the passages that in contrast to the material with which they are associated, the oracles contain many words and phrases commonly used by the Dtr historian. The clause, "I tore the kingdom" (1 Kgs 14,8), occurs elsewhere only in 1 Kgs 11,11.13.31, and 2 Kgs 17,21. 1 Kings 11 and 2 Kings 17 form the major framework for the Dtr account of the history of Israel. The clause, "I made you a leader (*nāgîd*) over" (1 Kgs 14,7; 16,2), is reminiscent of many Saul and David passages⁽²⁸⁾. Its occurrence in relation to Jeroboam and Baasha and the condemnation of their houses recalls the references to David as *nāgîd* in 2 Sam 7,8 where Yahweh through Nathan the prophet promises to establish David's house forever (2 Sam 7,16). The place of this speech within the framework of Dtr has been demonstrated by D. J. McCarthy⁽²⁹⁾. The phrases, "you have sold yourself" (1 Kgs 21,20.25), and "my servants the prophets" (2 Kgs 9,7) also figure prominently in 2 Kgs 17,13.17.23.

The general association of the oracles with Dtr has already been noted in our treatment of 1 Kgs 14,1-18 and 3 Reg 12,24g-n. Precisely those sections of the Ahijah oracle present in the MT account but not in the Greek witnesses showed evidence of Dtr language and style (MT 1 Kgs 14,7-10a.13aβ-16) and connected the condemnation of Jeroboam and his dynasty to the overall course of the kingdom of Israel.

⁽²⁶⁾ The contrast of Jeroboam and David in 1 Kgs 14,8 is a major theme of Dtr. See for example F. M. CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973) 284.

⁽²⁷⁾ WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy*, 26, puts forth a similar argument.

⁽²⁸⁾ 1 Sam 9,16; 13,14; 25,30; 2 Sam 6,21 and 1 Kgs 1,35.

⁽²⁹⁾ D. J. MCCARTHY, "II Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History", *JBL* 84 (1965) 131-138.

The structure of the oracles also indicates a time of composition consistent with the dating of the major Dtr editions. The grammatical structure of a causal clause introduced by *ya'an* ('*āšer*) followed by a result clause with (*lākēn*) *hinēnī*, is rare in pre-exilic material, occurring a few times in the Pentateuch and pre-exilic prophets and some six times in Jeremiah. In Ezekiel, however, it occurs in over twenty passages⁽³⁰⁾. In Kings, apart from our first three oracles, the structure occurs only a few times. In 2 Kgs 22,16-20⁽³¹⁾ the construction is used in association with Josiah's reaction to the book found in the temple, and in 1 Kgs 11,31-33 it occurs in Ahijah's prophecy to Jeroboam⁽³²⁾. Its prominence in Jeremiah and Ezekiel shows its increasing use in the late pre-exilic and exilic period, at least as witnessed by the biblical text.

This evidence collectively points to the Dtr historian as the source of the present shape of the oracles against the northern dynasties. This is not to say that older material does not exist in the four oracles. There are some elements in the oracles which occur nowhere else in Dtr. The curses are the chief example. The main curse, "The one belonging to PN who dies in the city, the dogs shall eat; the one (belonging to him) who dies in the country, the birds of the air shall eat" (1 Kgs 14,11; 16,4; 21,24), is reminiscent of two curses: Deut 28,16 "Cursed are you in the city and cursed are you in the country", and Deut 28,26 "Your corpse will be food for the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth and no one shall scare (them) away". The curse in the oracles combines elements equal or similar to these two curses. Further, D. Hillers in his work on treaty-curses has noted in the Deuteronomy 28 curses, "recognizable characteristics of material intended for oral transmission: a fixed pattern and a kind of rhythm"⁽³³⁾. The curse in the oracles with its

⁽³⁰⁾ See DIETRICH, *Prophetie*, 65-67, for details.

⁽³¹⁾ In 2 Kgs 22,16.17 the sequence is reversed, as frequently elsewhere. The causal clause is introduced by *taḥat* '*āšer*.

⁽³²⁾ It also occurs in 1 Kgs 3,11-12; 20,36 and 2 Kgs 1,16. *ya'an* '*āšer* is found several times without a result clause introduced by *hinēnī*; e.g. 1 Kgs 8,18; 11,11; 14,15; 20,28; 2 Kgs 10,30; 21,15. Many of these passages have already been cited in connection with the oracles being discussed.

⁽³³⁾ D. HILLERS, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (Rome 1964) 35.

approximate equality of line length and parallelism shows these characteristics as well.

The vassal-treaties of Esarhaddon offer examples of Ancient Near Eastern curses similar to the main curse in the oracles:

"May (Ninurta) feed you to the eagle (and) jackal" (Lines 426-7).

"May dogs and swine eat your flesh" (line 451)⁽³⁴⁾.

The curse against Jezebel (1 Kgs 21,23; 2 Kgs 9,10a) also has a parallel in the Esarhaddon treaties:

"May dog and swine drag your corpses around in the squares of Assur.

May it not receive (burial) in the earth" (Lines 482-4)⁽³⁵⁾.

These curses are a part of the regular list of curses attached to the vassal-treaties⁽³⁶⁾.

The curse in the oracles against the northern dynasties, therefore, has marked similarities to other curses both within and without the biblical material. This suggests that the Dtr editor has either adopted an ancient curse for the oracles or composed one using typical patterns, rhythms and images found in other Ancient Near Eastern curse formulae. The same could be said about some other expressions used within the oracles and related passages. In 1 Kgs 14,10 we have the statement, "I will consume Jeroboam's house as one burns up dung completely". In the Dtr passage, 1 Kgs 14,13aβ-16, we have another simile, "Yahweh shall smite Israel just as a reed is shaken in the water". Simile curses were very common in Ancient Near Eastern treaties⁽³⁷⁾. Of particular note here is one found in Esarhaddon's vassal-treaty:

⁽³⁴⁾ From texts in D. J. WISEMAN, "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon", *Iraq* 20 (1958) 61-64. WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy*, 131, lists this second comparison also. Assurbanipal texts contain curses similar to these.

⁽³⁵⁾ Cf. WISEMAN's division of the lines, *Esarhaddon*, 66. I have followed the division given in WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy*, 131, n. 6. This division makes better sense of the content of lines 482-484. It does not require a change of ownership of the corpus delecti concerned.

⁽³⁶⁾ Similar curses were also part of royal grants. See J. N. PORTGATE, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees* (Studia Pohl: Series Maior 1; Rome 1969) 27-32, texts 9 (l. 64), 10 (l. 64).

⁽³⁷⁾ See HILLERS, *Treaty-Curses*, 18-26, for a discussion of this type and further examples.

"May they (the gods) shake you like a reed in water" (Line 630)⁽³⁸⁾.

Examples are found elsewhere in the Bible, notably in Deut 28,29 and 49.

Also unique to the oracles is the expression *maštīn bēqîr 'āšûr wē' āzûb*, although we do get reflections of it in 1 Kgs 16,11 and 2 Kgs 14,26. The oaths by David in 1 Sam 25,22.34 involve the first half of the expression but the origin of the second half remains obscure. It is found in Deut 32,36 which suggests its antiquity⁽³⁹⁾. The reinterpretation of the expression in 1 Kgs 16,11 indicates that the writer was not clear as to the precise sense, suggesting antiquity. The exact meaning of the phrase remains obscure⁽⁴⁰⁾.

In addition it needs to be noted that both the curse and the expression above are included in the 3 Reg 12,24g-n account of Ahijah's oracle. With the absence of any other expressions typical of Dtr in this account it would suggest that both the curse and the expression above have been adopted by the Dtr editor from an earlier form of the oracle or from a broader background. Thus while we can admit that the Dtr editor has composed the oracles against the Israelite dynasties, some older material has been incorporated. However, this is not necessarily evidence for an older prophetic source⁽⁴¹⁾.

The Oracles and the Course of the Kingdom of Israel

It remains now to investigate their relation to other Dtr material pertaining to the history of the Israelite monarchy. In 1 Kgs 11,31-39 Ahijah proclaims to Jeroboam Yahweh's decision to take ten tribes out of the hand of the Davidic house. Jeroboam shall be king

⁽³⁸⁾ See WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy*, 133, n. 2, for comments on Wiseman's original reading and further Hittite examples of this curse.

⁽³⁹⁾ See WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy*, 132, n. 2. He also gives a reference to M. Held's discussion of the meaning of the phrase.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ For discussions on this phrase see GRAY, *Kings*, 337-338, and P. SAYDON, "The Meaning of the Expression *וְעָרַר וְעָרַר*", *VT* 2 (1952) 371-374 and references there.

⁽⁴¹⁾ GRAY, *Kings*, 30-32,358, argues that 1 Kgs 14,10.11 and 16,3.4 are part of an earlier "prophetic adaption of historical narrative" to which other material belonged as well. His delineation of this work remains speculative.

over these tribes (v. 37). If he obeys all Yahweh commands him, follows him, and does what is right in his sight, Yahweh promises to be with him and build him a "stable house" (v. 38). The condition placed on Jeroboam is to be as faithful to Yahweh as David was. If he is, Yahweh will do for him what he had done for David. Thus Dtr, while it generally views the kingdom of Israel in a negative light, would regard the establishment of the kingdom as a legitimate enterprise proclaimed by Yahweh himself. It had the potential to be a dynastic monarchy very much like that which followed David. The dynastic nature of the Israelite monarchy has been argued convincingly by G. Buccellati⁽⁴²⁾ and more recently by T. Ishida⁽⁴³⁾. The oracles studied in this paper also present this view. Jeroboam and Baasha are both referred to as *nāgīd*⁽⁴⁴⁾ (1 Kgs 14,7; 16,2). In the Dtr passage 2 Sam 7, David is called *nāgīd* (v. 8) in the context of the promise to him of an everlasting house (vv. 13-16). The distinction by Gray, for example, following A. Alt, that the use of *nāgīd* in the oracles against Jeroboam and Baasha "reflects the upholding of the conception of charismatic authority over hereditary monarchy"⁽⁴⁵⁾, is not substantiated by the material. Further the condemnations in the oracles are not against the Israelite dynasties as such, but rather are proclaimed on the basis of the continued participation of the various dynasties and monarchs in Jeroboam's disobedience.

This is the case with Jeroboam himself. In 1 Kgs 14,8, Yahweh's accusation is that Jeroboam has not been like David, that is, he has not fulfilled the condition required for a "stable house" to be established. He has not kept Yahweh's commandments, etc. Consequently his dynasty collapses. Similarly, Baasha's house falls because he "walked in the way of Jeroboam" (1 Kgs 16,2-3). Ahab

⁽⁴²⁾ G. BUCCELLATI, *Cities and Nations in Ancient Syria* (SS 26; Roma 1967) 200-208.

⁽⁴³⁾ T. ISHIDA, *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel* (Berlin-New York 1977) 171-182.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ See CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*, 220, n. 5 and 253, and R. DE VAUX, "The King of Israel, Vassal of Yahweh", *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Garden City 1967) 152-166, esp. 153 for discussions of *nagid* and its origin and references to further material.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ GRAY, *Kings*, 361. A. ALT initially argued for this position in "The Monarchy in the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah", *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* (New York 1968) 319-323.

does more evil than Jeroboam (1 Kgs 16,30-31) and his dynasty is condemned and is to be made like the two former ones (1 Kgs 21,22; 2 Kgs 9,9). Jehu is treated a little differently. While he does well eliminating the previous dynasty and its Baal worship, he is still noted as following the sin of Jeroboam (2 Kgs 10,31) and his dynasty is given a limited existence by Yahweh (v. 30).

The theme of obedience to the divine will outlined in 1 Kgs 11,28-38 is developed further in 1 and 2 Kings. Immediately following the description of the sins of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 12,25-33) are the two episodes involving a man of God from Judah. In the second of these closely related stories (1 Kgs 13,11-26) the man from Judah is persuaded against Yahweh's specific direction to return to Bethel to the old prophets. As a result of his disobedience he is killed by a lion. Vv. 21 and 26 show that disobedience to the commandment of Yahweh is the central issue in 1 Kings 13. W. Lemke has emphasised this in his study on the chapter⁽⁴⁶⁾. He has also pointed to the broader significance of the story. The first episode in 1 Kings 13 in which the man of God condemns the altar of Jeroboam at Bethel points to a more fundamental and national disobedience with which the Dtr editor has to deal, that of Jeroboam and his house. The obligation placed on Jeroboam by Yahweh in 1 Kgs 11,29-38 has been breached. Just as in the death of the man of God the editor spells out the consequences of his disobedience, so too in 1 Kgs 14,7-11 and 13a β -16 the consequences for Jeroboam's disobedience are proclaimed. Lemke has argued that it was the Dtr editor who gave 1 Kings 13 its present position⁽⁴⁷⁾. If our suggestion that 1 Kgs 14,7-11.13a β -16 are also the composition of the Dtr historian is correct, we can see a uniform purpose in the organisation of the Jeroboam cycle (1 Kings 11-14). As we noted earlier in the MT account of Jeroboam's sick son, the Ahijah prophecy setting up the northern kingdom, the disobedience of Jeroboam, the demise of the dynasty and the final destiny of Israel converge. Thus the activity and fate of Jeroboam and his dynasty become a picture of the fate of the whole kingdom. The end of the north is already

⁽⁴⁶⁾ W. E. LEMKE, "The Way of Obedience: I Kings 13 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History", *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God* (ed. F. M. CROSS, Jr., W. E. LEMKE and P. D. MILLER, Jr.) (Garden City 1976) 301-326, esp. 317-318.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ LEMKE, "The Way of Obedience", 307-313.

evident in its beginning. The account of Ahijah's oracle in the Greek texts does not lend itself to such a message by virtue of its position in 3 Reg 12,24g-n and the absence of the extended comments on Jeroboam's dynasty.

The theme of obedience/disobedience moves beyond Jeroboam. In the climax of the Dtr history of Israel, 2 Kgs 17,7-23, it is again highlighted (vv. 13-15a)⁽⁴⁸⁾. The nature of the obedience required needs to be considered. The editor of Dtr was referring specifically to covenantal obedience. Although in the establishment and history of the Israelite kingdom the word *bērît* is not mentioned, it is clear that the editor regarded the Israelite kingdom as still being under the Mosaic covenant. This is made explicit in 2 Kgs 17,15.35; 18,12. In 2 Kgs 17,24-31 the new inhabitants of the northern kingdom are portrayed as no more faithful than the former were to this covenant. The curse in each of the oracles also suggests that covenant disobedience is being considered. We noted before the similarity of the curse to one in Deut 28,26. The latter also occurs in Jer 34,20. In both places it is associated with covenant situations⁽⁴⁹⁾.

The final blow in the Dtr account of the northern kingdom comes in 2 Kgs 22,1-23,25 with the account of Josiah, one of the kings of Judah given unqualified approval by the editors, and equated with David (2 Kgs 22,1.2). His rise and removal of the offence of Israel are already anticipated in 1 Kgs 13,2. His obedience to Yahweh is unquestionable as can be seen by his reaction to the finding of the book of the law (1 Kgs 22,11-13.18-20). His reforms are based on the renewal of the covenant with Yahweh (23,3). Thus in all ways Josiah exhibits those qualities lacking in Jeroboam and his successors. His reincorporation of the northern kingdom under the rule of the Jerusalem centered, Davidic dynasty marks the end of the kingdom of Israel. The final note in Ahijah's initial oracle to Jeroboam (1 Kgs 11,39) has been fulfilled.

We have suggested an association of 1 Kgs 14,7-11; 16,2-4; 21,20-24 and 2 Kgs 9,6-10a with the Dtr editor. If this suggestion

⁽⁴⁸⁾ The theme crops up also in the brief description of the fall of Israel in 2 Kgs 18,9-12, esp. v. 12.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Cf. also the occurrences of the curse in Jer 7,33; 15,3; 16,4; 19,7 and Ezek 29,5; Ps 79,2. See D. J. MCCARTHY, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome 1963) 109-130 for a discussion of the covenantal structure and context of Deut 28.

is correct then the oracles can be seen as being a vital part of the Dtr framework of the history of Israel. The northern kingdom had begun its life on the same footing as the Judean, but it had been disobedient to the covenant of Yahweh. Not only were each of its kings condemned, but so too were its dynastic houses. These oracles have been constructed to describe those dynastic condemnations in vivid covenantal language. They plot the course of the Israelite dynasties alongside that of the Davidic. The contrast is startling. The northern houses have been consigned to the dogs and birds. It is ironic that the southern kingdom, so fervently supported by these same editors, was soon to see the vultures flying over its own head.

United Theological College
420 Liverpool Road
Enfield N.S.W. 2136
Australia

H. N. WALLACE

SOMMAIRE

Dans le premier et le deuxième livre des Rois, l'historien deutéronomiste structure l'histoire du royaume du Nord, Israël, soit au moyen d'oracles prophétiques (1 R 14,7-11; 16,1-4; 21,17-24 et 2 R 9,6-10) soit par une déclaration de Dieu (2 R 10,30) qui condamne chacune de ses dynasties. Une comparaison entre 1 R 14,1-18 (TM) et 3 R 12,24a-z montre que, bien que ces oracles contiennent des éléments anciens, le langage et le style sont typiquement deutéronomistes. Le rapprochement de ces oracles avec d'autres passages (1 R 11,29-39; 1 R 13 et 2 R 17,1-23) montre que les rédacteurs considéraient légitime l'instauration du royaume du Nord. Pourtant celui-ci rompait avec certaines obligations de l'alliance. Ce n'est que durant le règne de Josiah qu'il sera de nouveau soumis à l'ordonnance de l'alliance.

**Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Imitation
of Sources in Acts:
2 Kgs 5 as One Component of Acts 8,9-40**

The immediate purpose of this article is to show that Luke's stories of Simon and the Ethiopian (Acts 8,9-40) are modelled largely, but not exclusively, on the OT story of Naaman and Gehazi (2 Kgs 5). The Syrian commander's *physical* renewal — the cleansing of his leprosy — has been adapted to form a basis for describing the Ethiopian treasurer's *internal* renewal — his cleansing in baptism. The deviousness of Gehazi, his desire to use God's healing gift as a way of making money, has been adapted to depict the more internal deviation of Simon — his attempt to give money in order to have power over the gift of the Spirit, in other words, in order to have a power that was primarily internal. Thus, in describing Simon and the Ethiopian, Luke has distilled the essence of the OT text, and has used that essence as a basic component, a skeletal framework, around which he has grafted other material. Luke's processes of adaptation are to be seen in the context of the rhetorical practice of *imitatio*, particularly in the context of the imitative practice of internalizing ancient texts.

The more general purpose here is to suggest that Luke's method of adapting 2 Kgs 5 may provide a partial clue to an old problem, the question of the use of sources in Acts.

The article consists of five parts: (I) A few summary paragraphs concerning the long quest for the sources of Acts. (II) A brief survey of the way Greco-Roman writers, trained in rhetoric, generally used texts, and of the way Luke used the LXX. (III) An introductory analysis of 2 Kgs 5 and Acts 8,9-40 (IV) A detailed analysis of 2 Kgs 5 and Acts 8,9-40. (V) An assessment of the evidence.

I. The Sources of Acts: A Stalled Quest

For almost two hundred years, researchers have battled with the problem of the sources of Acts⁽¹⁾. In particular, beginning with the work of B. Königsmann in 1798, it has been asked whether its elements of diversity and duplication should be regarded as reliable indicators of a diversity of written sources⁽²⁾. The problem was more than a century old when A. Harnack, to some degree at least, did for Acts what Wellhausen had done for the Pentateuch: he gave personality to a number of hypothetical sources. Working largely on the basis of the places mentioned in the text, and, to some degree, on the basis of its mention of particular people, he distinguished, among other documents, what he called the Jerusalem-Caesarea source (cf. esp. 3,1-5,16; 8,5-40; 9,31-11,18; 12,1-23) and the Antioch source (cf. esp. 6,1-8,4; 11,19-30; 13,1-15,35)⁽³⁾. Aspects of this theory, particularly its idea of an Antioch source, have received a moderate amount of support⁽⁴⁾.

There have been several other theories, in particular that Acts (esp. 1,1-15,35) consists of a reworking of a major single document dealing with the early church, and that the use of "we" (cf. 16,10-17,

(1) For summaries of research, see A. C. MCGIFFERT, "The Historical Criticism of Acts in Germany", *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Acts of the Apostles* (5 vols.; ed. F. J. FOAKES JACKSON and K. LAKE) (London 1920-1933), II (1922) 363-395, esp. 385-395; J. DUPONT, *The Sources of the Acts* (New York 1964; French original: Bruges 1960); E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia 1971) 24-34; W. G. KÜMMEL, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville - New York 1975) 174-185; E. GRÄSSER, "Acta-Forschung seit 1960", *ThR* 41 (1976) 141-194, 259-290; 42 (1977) 1-68, esp. 41 (1976) 144-146, 186-194; G. SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte: Erster Teil: Einleitung. Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-8,40* (HTKNT 5/1; Freiburg 1980) 82-89.

(2) *De fontibus commentariorum sacrorum, quae Lucae nomen praeferrunt* (Altonae 1798). For brief accounts of the earliest researchers such as W. K. L. Ziegler (1801), J. G. Eichhorn (1810) and J. C. Riehm (1821), see esp. MCGIFFERT, "Acts in Germany", 385-386, and HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 24-25.

(3) See esp. *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das NT, III; Leipzig 1908) esp. 148-149.

(4) On the qualified acceptance of the idea of an Antioch source, esp. by R. Bultmann and P. Benoit, see DUPONT, *The Sources*, 62-72.

etc.) indicates either a distinct source or the personal involvement of the author⁽⁵⁾.

But little agreement has been reached. It is symptomatic of the depth of the problem that while M. Dibelius, using form-criticism, claimed that beneath the accounts of Paul's missionary journeys it is possible to detect an itinerary source, in other words, a source which gave the framework of Paul's itinerary⁽⁶⁾, D. H. Conzelmann sees no such source. For him the framework of the first journey (chaps. 13-14), for instance, is a creation of Luke's⁽⁷⁾.

Today the state of the entire quest is not substantially different from what it was when assessed in 1960 by J. Dupont⁽⁸⁾:

The predominant impression is certainly very negative. Despite the most careful and detailed research, it has not been possible to define any of the sources used by the author of Acts in a way which will meet with widespread agreement among the critics.

Given this state of stalemate, it seems better to stand back from the problem, and to ask a more basic question: how, in general, did ancient writers use sources? How did they compose a text? To answer this, it is necessary to look at rhetoric, particularly at the rhetorical practice of imitation.

II. Rhetorical Imitation of Texts and Luke's Use of the LXX

Greco-Roman writing was not carried out in a vacuum. It was governed by the pervasive rules of rhetoric⁽⁹⁾, and one of the most basic of those rules was that of imitation.

⁽⁵⁾ See esp. DUPONT, *The Sources*, 17-32, 75-112.

⁽⁶⁾ "Stilkritisches zur Apostelgeschichte," *Eucharisterion für Hermann Gunkel* (2 vols.; Göttingen 1923) 2.27-49. ET: *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London 1956) 1-25.

⁽⁷⁾ *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HNT 7; Tübingen 1972) 80.

⁽⁸⁾ *The Sources*, 166.

⁽⁹⁾ For a broad approach to the vast phenomenon of rhetoric, see W. J. ONG, *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology* (Ithaca-London 1971), esp. 1-22. For a brief survey of the place of rhetoric in Greco-Roman education, and for basic bibliographical references, see W. S. KURZ, "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts", *CBQ* 42 (1980) 170-195, esp. 192-195.

As already described at greater length in this journal⁽¹⁰⁾, *imitatio* sought to imitate and rival existing texts. It was used by almost all types of writers, including biographers and historians. Thus, Tacitus' detailed account of how Germanicus, the emperor's adopted son, visited a tragic battlefield in 15 A. D. draws largely on Tacitus' own account, written earlier, of a visit by Emperor Vitellius, in 69 A. D., to a completely different battlefield⁽¹¹⁾.

Among imitation's most basic techniques were those of abbreviation, elaboration, division and fusion (or synthesis) — including the dividing and fusing of diverse characters. A further important technique was that of internalization, in other words, that of taking an existing text, especially a text that was old, and reworking it in a way which emphasized values that were internal.

The widespread practice of imitating texts is pertinent to the question of Luke's use of sources. As has been indicated elsewhere⁽¹²⁾ it is quite likely, *a priori*, that Luke imitated the LXX; and this likelihood appears to be confirmed by the facts, by the increasing evidence that the use of the LXX, including precise techniques of imitation, is reflected in various passages of Luke's text. To some degree such use may be seen in Luke 1-2⁽¹³⁾, in the framework of Luke 1-4⁽¹⁴⁾, and in Stephen's speech⁽¹⁵⁾; but it is particu-

⁽¹⁰⁾ T. L. BRODIE, "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37: A Study of Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation", *Bib* 64 (1983) 457-485, esp. 459-464. For a general introduction to imitation, see BRODIE, "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources", *Luke-Acts. New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (ed. C. H. TALBERT) (New York 1984) 17-46.

⁽¹¹⁾ See T. WOODMAN, "Self-Imitation and the Substance of History: Tacitus, *Annals* 1.61-65 and *Histories* 2.70, 5.14-15", *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (ed. D. WEST and T. WOODMAN) (London-New York 1979) 143-155.

⁽¹²⁾ BRODIE, "Greco-Roman Imitation", 32-34.

⁽¹³⁾ See esp. R. LAURENTIN, *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II* (EBib; Paris 1957) 42-92; R. E. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah* (Garden City, NY 1977) 235-499.

⁽¹⁴⁾ See T. L. BRODIE, "A New Temple and a New Law: The Unity and Chronicler-based Nature of Luke 1:1-4:22a", *JSNT* 5 (1979) 21-45.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See E. RICHARD, *Acts 6:1-8:4: The Author's Method of Composition* (SBLDS 41; Missoula 1978), esp. p. 145.

larly strong in Luke 7⁽¹⁶⁾, and, significantly, in the account of Stephen's trial and death⁽¹⁷⁾.

If the imitating of the LXX provides a clue as to the sources of some sections of Luke's work, including the Stephen section in Acts, then perhaps it can also help with regard to other passages from Acts. It is with this in mind that it seems worthwhile to take a fresh look at the LXX.

III. 2 Kgs 5 and Acts 8,9-40: Introductory Analysis

As one sifts through the episodes of the LXX, wondering whether or to what extent they have been used in Acts, 2 Kgs 5 tends to attract attention. This is a story which, in the programmatic Nazareth speech (4,16-30, esp. 4,27), Luke singles out for explicit mention as a kind of model. When one asks which episode, if any, in Acts, reflects the Naaman story, it is difficult not to become suspicious of the story of the Ethiopian. After all, the NT does not have many stories about prestigious foreigners coming in chariots. One immediately sees great differences between the stories, particularly the fact that the latter part of the Naaman story is taken up with the money-minded Gehazi, and for that there is no equivalent at all in the story of the Ethiopian. But then one notices that immediately before the Ethiopian story, there is the story of Simon, someone who, in his own way, was quite money-minded. And so one's suspicions are strengthened.

It turns out that the relationship between the texts is quite complex, and to understand it, it is first necessary that the texts be summarized.

The OT passage, far from being a raw miracle account, is a delicately composed narrative. It tells of an imposing man who, through his servants, came to appreciate what is small and lowly, in other words, who passed from one mentality to another, and who

⁽¹⁶⁾ See T. L. BRODIE, "Towards Unraveling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17:17-24", *NTS*, forthcoming, 1986; BRODIE, "Luke 7:36-50 as an Internalization".

⁽¹⁷⁾ T. L. BRODIE, "The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth (1 Kgs 21:8-13) as One Component of the Stephen Text", *CBQ* 45 (1983) 417-432.

thus was healed. And, in contrast, it tells also of the exploitive servant, Gehazi.

The NT tells first of Simon, the man who had once been regarded as great and who was intent on maintaining some form of power, and, second, of the Ethiopian who, despite his exalted position, was eager to learn from the account of the humble Servant.

Luke has taken the contrasting mentalities or characteristics of Naaman and attributed them to the contrasting characters of Simon and the Ethiopian. And he uses Gehazi also as a basis for depicting Simon. Thus the figure of Simon, as now described in Acts 8, involves a fusing of two basic elements: Naaman's initial preoccupation with greatness; and Gehazi's money-mindedness. This does not explain what is *missing* in Luke's text — the well-known problem of why, unlike Justin and Irenaeus, he says nothing of Simon as a leader of some form of heresy or gnosticism⁽¹⁸⁾ — but it does help to explain a significant part of what is present.

As well as thus adapting the characters, the *dramatis personae*, Luke has also made several adaptations of content. In particular, the idea of a physical washing, a washing which cleanses the body, is replaced by the washing of baptism, a cleansing which is more internal.

And Gehazi's desire for money is replaced by Simon's giving of money so that he may have spiritual power, in other words by a desire which is more obviously in the realm of the spiritual or internal.

Thus, to a considerable extent, Luke's reworking of the OT text involves a process of internalization.

For a scientific historian, such a process — of adapting characters and content — seems odd and far-fetched. Yet such were the practices of literary imitation, and such also were the practices which Luke himself employed elsewhere. His reworking of 2 Kgs 5 is quite similar to his earlier reworking, in Luke 7,36-50, of 2 Kgs 4,1-37⁽¹⁹⁾. Odd though some of these practices may appear therefore

(18) For a review of recent research on Simon, see GRÄSSER "Acta-Forschung", 42 (1977) 1-68, esp. 25-34. See also R. McL. WILSON, "Simon and Gnostic Origins", *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (ed. J. KREMER) (BETL XLVIII; Gembloux 1979) 485-491.

(19) BRODIE, "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization", 468-470.

from the point of view of scientific history, from another point of view they were acceptable.

And they make sense. What Luke in effect has done is take an OT text, a text which despite its power is rather subtle and obscure, and render it into images which are clear and which emphasize what is internal. The problem of being preoccupied with greatness, a problem which is not stated explicitly in the OT, is brought out much more clearly in the figure of Simon. The value of open-mindedness, half hidden in Naaman, comes to the fore in the figure of the Ethiopian. Luke, therefore, has not written to distort the OT text, but to develop it.

IV. 2 Kgs 5 and Acts 8,9-40: Detailed Analysis

An initial idea of the way in which Luke has reworked the details of the OT text may be had from the outline on the following page. In many ways the outline simplifies. It omits those verses of Acts 8,9-40 for which 2 Kgs 5 seems to provide no base whatever. And it overstates some similarities. But it provides a starting-point for discussion.

The analysis given below generally follows the order of the outline. However, the section on the captured servant (2 Kgs 5,2) is not dealt with in sequence. And there are some other complicating details. By and large, though, the sequence is maintained.

1. *A foreign royal official, a great man (2 Kgs 5,1.3-5.11-12; Acts 8,9-11.27b).*

Naaman, in simplified terms, is a royal official, and is regarded as a great man. In Acts 8, Simon is regarded as great, and the Ethiopian is a royal official. On the one hand, therefore, Naaman's status as "great" (2 Kgs 5,1), and his misguided preference for actions and objects that are great (2 Kgs 5,11-12) have been used together as one factor in characterizing the negative figure of Simon. On the other hand, Naaman's status as a foreign royal official has been used in Acts 8 to depict another foreign royal official, the Ethiopian.

These two items will be dealt with separately.

2 Kings 5

Acts 8

Naaman, in charge of the army...
...was regarded as a great man
...was mighty (*dynatos*), a leper.
(v. 1; cf. vv. 3-5, 11-12)

Captured servant suggests the prophet (2)

Naaman brings treasure and reading to the king; he ignores the prophet. (6-7)

Elisha sends so that Naaman may know of the prophet; he comes in his chariot. (8-9; cf. 15a)

Elisha sends an *aggelos* to say, Go (down) to the Jordan and wash. (10)

Naaman wants something great from the prophet, but his servants suggest humility. (11-13)

Naaman goes down, washes. (14)

Naaman offers something; Gehazi takes money for the cure. (15b-24) (Naaman desires Israel-based worship.)

Elisha confronts Gehazi. (25-27)

Simon was regarded as great. (9-11)

He offers money for the Spirit. (17-19)

Peter confronts Simon. (20-23)

An angel sends Philip down to the... desert. (26-27a)

Eunuch was powerful (*dynastēs*), in charge of the treasury (27b). (Had come worshipping to Jerusalem).

He was reading the prophet, without knowing what he was reading. (28. 30b-31a)

The Spirit sends Philip to the chariot, so that the Ethiopian may know the prophet. (cf. 29-30, 34-35)

The prophet speaks of the Servant who was... led... in humility. (32-33)

Eunuch goes down, is baptized. (38-39)

- (a) *The man preoccupied with greatness* (cf. 2 Kgs 5, 1a.3-5a.11-12; Acts 8,9-11).

While the general correspondence of the two texts is fairly clear — both present individuals who are unduly taken up with great-

ness — the correspondence of the details is quite complex. In fact, Luke's treatment of the OT text is like an extended intricate word-play. The main elements of the correspondences may be outlined thus:

“And Naaman,	“But a man named Simon was previously practising magic in the city,
ruler of the <i>dynamis</i> ,	
was a great man before his lord,	astonishing the nation of Samaria,
and wondered at in countenance* —	saying that he was someone great,
because in him the Lord gave deliverance to Syria...” (1a)	
From the small maid to the king,	to whom all gave heed, from small
people attend to Naaman. (3-5a)	to great, saying,
	‘This man is the <i>dynamis</i> .
“...call on...his God...a great thing...” (cf. 11-13)	of God which is called Great’”. (9-10)

* i.e., he was regarded with wonder.

As the outline shows, the OT text provides no basis for the initial description of Simon as a magician. But everything else in Luke's text seems to involve a reworking of 2 Kgs 5. The word *dynamis* is changed to refer, not to a force or army, but to a power of God. (However, even in the OT, the *dynamis* was in some sense an instrument of God. Through it, or at least through its commander, the Lord had delivered Syria.) In varied ways, both Naaman and Simon were regarded as great. The sense of wonder at what Naaman had helped do for Syria is balanced by Samaria's sense of astonishment at the power of Simon. Both Naaman and Simon receive attention from diverse people, people small and great. Finally, Naaman's implicit demand for a spectacular God, for a prophet who would call publicly on his God and who would command something great (2 Kgs 5,11-13), that demand is balanced by the equally sensation-oriented religion proposed by Simon, by his pretension to be the great power of God.

The following verse in Luke (8,11), the rather repetitious account of Simon's practice of magic, may, perhaps, be inspired in

part by the repetitiousness of the description of Naaman's angry reaction (5,11-12).

Luke's use of the OT does not rule out his use of other sources. On the contrary, given his tendency to fuse two or more texts, the use of other material is to be expected — in this case material pertaining to Simon's role in Samaria. According to Justin, the Samaritans revered Simon as the first or highest god⁽²⁰⁾. Presumably Luke used this and other information in giving his material its present shape.

The essential point, however, from the point of view of this study, is that, whatever be the extent of Luke's information about the historical Simon, his final picture of the magician, as now found in the text of Acts, includes a careful reworking of the text of 2 Kgs 5. Naaman's spectacular standing, and his misconception about a spectacular God, have been used to depict the spectacular standing of Simon and his misrepresentation of God as a source of spectacle.

Despite Luke's considerable adaptations, in various ways his wording echoes the OT text and at times seems to play with it:

OT: ἄρχων τῆς δυνάμεως... ἦν ἄνθρωπος μέγας... καὶ τεθαυμασμένος προσώπῳ ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ... καὶ... νεάνιδα μικράν... [vv 11-13:] πρὸς μὲ πάντως ἐξελεύσεται καὶ ἐπικαλέσεται... θεοῦ αὐτοῦ... μέγαν λόγον

NT: ἄνθρωπος... προ-ὑπ-ἦρχεν... μέγαν, ὃν προσεῖχον πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου... ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη Μεγάλη. προσεῖχον δὲ αὐτῷ...

It does not seem possible, at least at this point, to give a firm judgement on some of the similarities of detail, on whether they result from deliberate word-play. It is worth noting, however, that in Luke's description of another Simon, Simon the Pharisee (based on 2 Kgs 4), there is evidence of similar word-play⁽²¹⁾.

⁽²⁰⁾ 1 *Apol.* 26.3; *Dial.* 120.6.

⁽²¹⁾ BRODIE, "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization", 473.

(b) *The foreign royal official* (cf. 2 Kgs 5,1.5b; Acts 8,27b).

As already seen, the picture of Naaman as commander of the *dynamis* has been used to depict Simon as a *dynamis*. But no use has so far been made of the fact that being commander-in-chief meant being a high official, close to the king, and it is that aspect of Naaman which Luke uses as a foundational element in describing the Ethiopian. Luke's picture involves three adaptations of the OT text.

First, the foreign country in question is not Syria, but Ethiopia. In other words, while the idea of a foreign country has been kept, it has been so adapted that it no longer refers to neighbouring Syria but — in accordance with the overall plan of Acts (1,8: "...in... Judea and Samaria and to the ends of the earth") — to a country which represents the ends of the earth, Ethiopia.

Second, the official is in charge, not of the army (*dynamis*), but of the treasury. Though Luke sometimes tells of army figures (cf. esp. the centurion and Cornelius, Luke 7,1-10; Acts 10), this adaptation is understandable. He had already used and transformed the image of the *dynamis*. What he had not used was the idea of Naaman's treasure. For when Naaman comes to Israel, he brings, not an army, but a treasure that is quite considerable — ten silver talents, six thousand pieces of gold, and ten sets of robes. How he should be able to bring so great a treasure is not explained, but his doing so is presented in the context of the approval he enjoyed with his king (2 Kgs 5,5b). Thus, instead of someone who emerges from the royal presence and brings treasure, Luke depicts someone who is over the royal treasure.

Third, the official is presented not as leper, but as a eunuch. Without attempting to unravel the full implications of this adaptation, it has an immediate reasonableness: in some eastern regions "it was the general practice to have eunuchs for treasurers"⁽²²⁾. In other words, once Luke decided to replace the figure of a Syrian commander by that of an Ethiopian treasurer, it made sense — given the eastern custom of frequently having eunuchs as treasurers — to describe that treasurer as a eunuch. Similarly, the figure of the Syrian king is replaced by the specifically Ethiopian figure of the Candace

(²²) Cf. Plutarch, *Demetrios* 25,5.

or queen⁽²³⁾. Thus, Luke's text keeps the basic figure of a foreign official, but replaces the setting of the Syrian monarchy by details appropriate to a new context, that of the Ethiopian monarchy. A similar phenomenon may be noticed in comparing the fates of Naboth and Stephen: the basic figure of a just man undergoing false accusation is preserved in the depiction of Stephen, but the institutional setting involved in the Naboth case (the ancient monarchy and popular court) has been systematically replaced by details appropriate to an institutional setting which is of more interest to Luke's account (the synagogue and Sanhedrin)⁽²⁴⁾.

While the figure of the eunuch thus suits the new setting, it also suits Luke's theological theme of God's mercy for all, including those who, like eunuchs, had previously been regarded as excluded from the community (cf. Deut 23,1-2).

The essential point is that the Ethiopian official is significantly similar to the Syrian official, and that insofar as he is different, the differences may reasonably be seen as reflecting Luke's specific purposes, especially his purpose of indicating the spread of the word to the ends of the earth.

It is worth noting at this stage that Luke's reworking of the Naaman story has been influenced not only by his general editorial purposes, but also by his desire to build narrative continuity with earlier parts of his own text, particularly with the Emmaus story (Luke 24,13-35). In fact, the story of how Philip encountered the Ethiopian and explained the scriptures to him has been so shaped that, to some degree, it is like a variation on the story of how Jesus met the men on the road to Emmaus and explained the scriptures to them⁽²⁵⁾. A similar phenomenon may be seen in Luke's use of the

(23) As HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 310, notes, "Candace" was not a particular queen's name, but rather a title given to the Ethiopian queen mother.

(24) See BRODIE, "The Accusing... of Naboth", 423.

(25) See J. A. GRASSI, "Emmaus Revisited (Luke 24,13-35 and Acts 8,26-40)", *CBQ* 26 (1964) 463-467; C. H. LINDIJER, "Two Creative Encounters in the Work of Luke (Luke XXIV 13-35 and Acts VIII 26-40)", *Miscellanea Neotestamentica* (2 vols.; NTS 47/48; Leiden 1978) 2.77-86, esp. 80-81. As well as echoing the Emmaus text, the Ethiopian story also involves a certain foreshadowing of the Cornelius episode (Acts 10,1-11,18). For discussion, see GRÄSSER, "Acta-Forschung", 42 (1977) 34. The hypothesis that the Ethiopian story once existed on its own, in competition with the Cornelius

Naboth story: he adapts it to Stephen, but does so in a way which maintains continuity with other quite distinct episodes, episodes concerning Jesus and Paul⁽²⁶⁾. Thus, for Luke the OT does indeed provide a basis, a foundation, but it is a text which ultimately is subordinated to a new narrative.

Despite Luke's processes of adapting, his final wording retains some echoes of the older text:

OT: ὁ ἄρχων τῆς δυνάμεως... καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἦν δυνατὸς...

NT: ἀνὴρ... δυνάστης... ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γάζης

2. *Royal backing, money and reading — but no knowledge of the prophet (2 Kgs 5,6-7; Acts 8,25b.30b-31a)*²⁷

When Naaman comes to Israel he seems to have everything in his favor — access to royalty, treasure and even a *biblion*. *Biblion* may refer to almost anything written, including a letter or legal document, but it generally refers to a book or scroll. In this case the *biblion* is from the Syrian king to the king of Israel, requesting a cure for Naaman. But it is useless. When the king of Israel reads it, it appears to him as provocative nonsense. The original suggestion, that Naaman go to the prophet, appears to be forgotten. Thus, despite royal backing, riches and the reading of the *biblion*, Naaman has not done the one thing necessary — establish appropriate communication with the prophet.

The eunuch also has royal backing, riches, and a process of reading — he is reading Isaiah (*ton prophētēn Ēsaian*) — yet internally he is at a certain distance from the prophet; he does not really understand what he is reading.

Luke's text involves several adaptations. First, there is modernization. The royal backing has been adapted to the context of Ethiopia and to the absence of a monarchy in Israel. Thus, instead of depicting an Israelite king as reading in the presence of the for-

episode (cf. CONZELMANN, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 63), is unnecessary, and, in view of the dependence of Luke's text on 2 Kgs 5, highly unlikely. On the place of the Ethiopian story within the theological framework of Acts 8,5-11,18, see R. F. O'TOOLE, "Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts VIII 25-40)", *JSNT* 17 (1983) 25-34.

⁽²⁶⁾ See BRODIE, "The Accusing... of Naboth", 419-420.

eign official, Luke describes the foreign official as himself doing the reading.

Second, there is internalization. Instead of a process of reading which is physically at a distance from Israel's prophet, Luke depicts a reading in which the distance is internal. The eunuch has Isaiah in his hands but does not understand him.

Third, there is fusion. The basic idea of reading a *biblion*, plus the quite distinct idea of being at a distance from the prophet, have been fused to become the single complex idea of reading (a *biblion* of) the prophet Isaiah⁽²⁷⁾ while being at some internal distance.

The essential point is that, for both foreign officials, royal backing, treasure and reading are not enough. They still need to communicate effectively with the prophet.

In these texts verbal similarity is minimal. However, it is worth noting:

OT: βασιλεὺς... βιβλίον... βασιλέα... βιβλίον... βασιλέα...
βιβλίον... ἀνέγνω βασιλεὺς... βιβλίον
NT: βασιλίσσης... ἀνεγίνωσκεν τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν

Even though the word for reading, *anaginōskō*, is fairly common (LXX, c. 60 occurrences; NT, 32), there are very few other instances in the Bible which speak of a king or royal official as actually reading. The clearest cases are Hezekiah (cf. 2 Kgs 19,14; Isa 37,14) and Josiah (cf. 2 Kgs 22,2-23,2; 2 Chr 34,14-30), and one might perhaps add a few other cases such as Ezra the scribe (cf. Neh 8), and Jehudi, the messenger of Jehoiakim (cf. Jer 36,21-23). There is considerable significance, therefore, as far as assessing whether similarities are coincidental or deliberate is concerned, in the fact that the picture of a king or royal official as reading is found both in 2 Kgs 5 and Acts 8.

3. *The two sendings which lead to knowing the prophet and something other (2 Kgs 5,8-10.15a. Acts 8,29.30b.26-27a.34-35).*

Just at the point when Naaman may seem to be going nowhere, there is a double intervention on the part of Elisha: he sends to the

(27) In Luke's only explicit reference to reading a *biblion*, the *biblion* in question is Isaiah (Luke 4,17). Thus, for what it is worth, Luke's connecting of *biblion* with the prophet Isaiah has a precedent in his gospel.

king to tell Naaman come to him; and then, as Naaman in his chariot stands at the door, he sends a messenger to tell him go wash in the Jordan. The two sendings, which are set up to some degree like parallels, create a tension that is rather mysterious. Naaman comes in order that, as Elisha says, he may know there is a prophet. But then, when he comes, he is sent away. Much to his angry puzzlement, he does not see Elisha, nor does the prophet touch him physically. Apparently the prophetic power which he is to get to know is something other than what may be seen and touched, something other than the prophet himself. At any rate, there are two quasi-parallel sendings which suggest mystery and which bring the official from ignorance of the prophet to angry puzzlement about the prophet.

In the case of the Ethiopian also there are two sendings: the Spirit tells Philip to come to the chariot; and the angel of the Lord had already told Philip to go down towards the desert. As in the OT, the two sendings are set up, to some degree, like parallels⁽²⁸⁾. And what they achieve is similar: they indicate, quite clearly, the presence of mystery, and they lead the Ethiopian official from not knowing what the prophet says to a calm puzzlement about the prophet: "I pray you, of whom does the prophet say this: of himself, or of some other?" In other words, what had been dimly implied in the OT, that getting to know the prophet involves the presence of mystery, is dramatized vividly in the NT through the mystery-filled intervention of the Spirit and the angel of the Lord. And the OT text's enigmatic indication that getting to know the prophet meant getting to know something beyond the prophet, something other, is stated in the NT as a clear question: Is the prophet telling me to focus on himself or on someone other? In both texts the foreign official is led to knowing something else: in one case, the God of Israel (2 Kgs 5,15a); in the other, Jesus (Acts 8,35). Thus, the OT cryptic suggestion of a mysterious other is elaborated into vividly clear references to the presence of mystery and to another.

This procedure, of rendering a text that is obscure into one that is vivid and clear, was common in imitation and is found elsewhere

⁽²⁸⁾ On the two sendings as variations on the basic idea of divine intervention, see, for instance, HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 311; SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 501-502.

in Luke, particularly in his reworking of the account of raising the widow's son⁽²⁹⁾.

Looking at the texts in slightly more detail, it emerges that Luke's account of the two sendings involves a complex blend of careful continuity and considerable adaptation.

There is continuity between the OT sending which brings Naaman in his chariot to Elisha's door in order that he might know the prophet (2 Kgs 5,8-9), and the NT sending which causes Philip to come to the Ethiopian's chariot in order to ask him if he knows the prophet's text (Acts 8,29.30b). The focal point in both is the need to get to know the prophet or the prophetic word.

And there appears to be continuity also, but of a less obvious kind, between Elisha's sending of a messenger (*aggelos*) to tell Naaman to go down to the Jordan in order that he might be cleansed (2 Kgs 5,10), and the angel's sending of Philip down the elusive "way" towards "the desert" (Acts 8,26-27a). Both seem to suggest places of cleansing or renewal⁽³⁰⁾. The fact that it turns out, against all odds, to be a place of water and baptism (Acts 8,36-38) lends further credibility to this idea. Thus the sending of Naaman to wash in the Jordan is balanced by the sending of Philip to a place which, in some ways, is reminiscent of the Jordan.

What is certain, in any case, is that in both texts there are two quasi-parallel sendings, and that the basic effect of these sendings is to lead the foreign official closer to knowing the prophet and to knowing something other than the prophet.

With regard to adaptations, the first and most basic has already been indicated: the sense of mystery is brought into the open, clarified.

Second, instead of having two sendings in immediate succession ("Elisha... sent... Elisha sent..."), the NT moves the later sending, the order to go down to the place of renewal, to the very beginning

⁽²⁹⁾ For further details on Luke's tendency towards dramatic clarity, and on the similarity of that tendency to the methods of Livy, see BRODIE, "Luke 7:11-17 as an Imitatio". On the place of brevity and vividness in ancient narrative, see W. C. VAN UNNIK, "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography", *Les Actes*, 37-60, esp. 52-57.

⁽³⁰⁾ In Luke 3,3-4 the *way* in the *desert* is associated with washing in the Jordan. Thus, again for what it is worth (cf. note 27), the connection has a precedent in the gospel.

of the passage: "But an angel of the Lord spoke to Philip, saying, 'Arise...'" (Acts 8,26). The full reasons for this change may be quite complex, but one of them seems to be an extension of the reason already given — for greater clarity with regard to the presence of mystery. In other words, by putting the reference to the angel of the Lord at the very beginning of the text, the presence of a mysterious element is further highlighted, is made more vivid. A similar procedure may be observed in Livy. "He... reorganizes the structural arrangement, and introduces new material to achieve more dramatic effects"⁽³¹⁾.

As for the fact that the order to go down is directed not towards the Jordan, but southwards, away from Jerusalem, this may, perhaps, be influenced by the fact that the general thrust of Acts 1–8, especially in chap. 8, is to move away from Jerusalem and towards even the most extreme parts of the earth.

What is essential is that the two rather cryptic sendings of the OT are adapted to become two sendings in which the presence of mystery, the mystery surrounding the prophetic word, is much clearer.

There is a further detail, rather subtle, which is worth noting. In the OT, Naaman's preoccupation with the prophet, and with a rather crude approach to him, to being touched by him, is broken by the servants' intervention. They ask a gentle question which brings Naaman from his crude approach to an approach which enables him to see beyond the prophet (2 Kgs 5,13: "If the prophet had said... to you...?"). The gentleness of this transitional question concerning what the prophet had said, this question through which the path is opened for the official to see further, accounts, to some degree, for the gentle, transitional question which opens the way for the Ethiopian to see further, to move from his concentration on the prophet Isaiah to someone else (Acts 8,34: "I pray you, of whom does the prophet say...?"). A full analysis of this detail would require more space than is warranted in this brief study.

Despite the adaptations, the NT still has echoes of the OT wording:

⁽³¹⁾ See P. G. WALSH, *Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge 1961) 190.

- OT: ἤκουσεν... ἐλθέτω δὴ πρὸς με... καὶ... γνώτω ὅτι ἔστιν
προφήτης... καὶ ἦλθεν... ἐν... ἄρματι
- NT: Πρόσελθε... τῷ ἄρματι... ἤκουσεν... τὸν προφήτην...
γινώσκεις
- OT: ἀπέστειλεν... ἄγγελον πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγων Πορευθεῖς
- NT: Ἄγγελος... ἐλάλησεν πρὸς Φίλιππον λέγων... πορεύου
- OT: (Gentle transitional question): ἐλάλησεν ὁ προφήτης πρὸς σέ
- NT: (Gentle transitional question): Δέομαί σου... ὁ προφήτης λέ-
γει

4. *The servant(s): captive and humble* (cf. 2 Kgs 5,2.13; Acts 8,32-33).

One of the difficult judgements, in relating the texts, concerns the image of the servant(s).

In the OT text, a crucial but obscure role is played by the servants — by the small maid who was *taken away captive*, and by the servants who implied the idea of doing something *humble*.

In the NT a crucial role is played by the Servant, someone who is both captive and humble: “As a lamb *led*... In his *humiliation*...”.

It could be argued that the striking quotation from Isaiah is used to synthesize the two ideas of captivity and humility, and also to render the image of the servants into a form that is more explicit and vivid.

The difficulty is that neither the small girl nor the Isaian figure is explicitly called a servant. Resolution of this difficulty would require an extensive discussion about the literary continuity, first, between the small girl and “the servants”, and, second, between the Isaian figure and Luke’s explicit references to Jesus as servant (Acts 3,13.26; 4,27.30).

5. *The foreign official washes and is renewed* (2 Kgs 5,14; Acts 8,38-39)

As Naaman went down and washed seven times in the Jordan, so the Ethiopian, along with Philip, went down to the water and was baptized. As a result of the washing, Naaman was changed physically: his flesh became like that of a little child. For the Ethiopian the change was internal, and it is reflected in the fact that, when he went on his way, he was “rejoicing”.

The wording is worth noting:

OT: καὶ κατέβη... καὶ ἐβαπτίσατο

NT: καὶ κατέβησαν... καὶ ἐβάπτισεν

6. *The attempt to exchange the mysterious gift for money (2 Kgs 5,15b-24; Acts 8,17-19).*

When Naaman returned to Elisha and offered him something, the prophet steadfastly refused. But Elisha's servant, Gehazi, felt that he must try to get some of what Naaman "had brought". So he ran after him and made up an excuse to ask for money and clothing. "Give... a talent of silver...", he said. And the Syrian gave him what he asked.

In Acts 8, it is Simon who regards the gift of God as something to be exchanged for money. When he saw that, through the laying on of the apostles' hands, the Spirit was given, "he brought" money to them and said, "Give me also this power...".

But while Gehazi wants to sell the gift, to make money through it, Simon wants to buy it. In other words, while Gehazi is preoccupied with wealth, Simon is preoccupied with spiritual power. By thus focussing on this desire for spiritual power, Luke's text once again emphasizes what is internal.

The similarity of wording is limited but significant:

OT: ἐνήνοχεν... δὸς δὴ αὐτοῖς... ἀργυρίου... ἀργυρίου... [v. 26, τὸ ἀργύριον]

NT: προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα... δότε... [20, τὸ ἀργύριον]

One of the factors that needs further research is the use of hands, the way something is received through hands or through the laying on of (a) hand(s). On this question both texts imply a distinction between something good and something bad. In the OT distinction, *the process of receiving from people's hands is bad* ("receiving" in or from "the hand[s]" is associated with giving or receiving money for the gift; cf 2 Kgs 5,5.15-16.20.23-24.26). And the *good* (the free and authentic bestowal of the gift) is *that which is given without hands* (without the laying on of a hand; 5,11). To put it simply: as far as the gift is concerned, the use of hands is bad. In the NT (Acts 8,15-19), the distinction is rather different: in the bestowal of the gift there is a use of hands which is good (that performed by the apostles) and a use of hands which is bad (that

desired by Simon). Luke's distinction keeps the essence of the OT idea: it condemns a use of hands which exploits the gift for selfish purposes. But he does not condemn the basic idea of the laying on of (a) hand(s). Luke's salvaging of the idea of the laying on of hands should probably be seen, partly at least, as reflecting his general tendency, in this part of Acts, to speak of some process or other involving the laying on of hands (cf. Acts 6,6; 9,12.17; 13,3)⁽³²⁾.

As often, Luke's wording is much more economical:

- OT: [vv. 5,11, ἔλαβεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ... ἐπιτιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα]... λάβε... λήμψομαι... λαβεῖν... λαβεῖν ἐκ χειρὸς... λήμψομαι... λάβε... ἔλαβεν... ἔλαβεν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν καὶ παρέθετο... [26, ἔλαβες... ἔλαβες]
- NT: [v. 15, λάβωσιν]... ἐπιτίθουν τὰς χεῖρας... καὶ ἐλάμβανον... ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν... ἐπιθῶ τὰς χεῖρας λαμβάνη.

As well as speaking of Gehazi's attempt to get money, the OT text at this point refers also to Naaman's desire for true worship (2 Kgs 5,17-19). He wishes to have two mule-loads of the earth of Israel as a base for building an altar, and he apologizes that his duties involve him in other worship. This entire text, which is rather complex, appears to have been distilled into the note which says that the Ethiopian had come worshipping to Jerusalem (Acts 8,27c). In other words, the desire for an Israel-based worship has been abbreviated and updated to refer to Jerusalem-based worship.

- OT: [v. 15, θεὸς... Ἰσραήλ]... προσκυνῆσαι... προσκυνήσω... προσκυνεῖν
- NT: προσκυνήσων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

However, while the OT puts this desire for contact with the traditional geographical center (Israel/Jerusalem) *after* the renewal, Luke puts it *before*, and, unlike the OT text, does not give any indication that the renewed man retained any further relationship to Jerusalem. As in the case of the angel's directing of Philip to a road which leads away from Jerusalem, this adaptation, to some degree at least, probably reflects the tendency of Acts 1-8, and especially of chap. 8, to depict a general movement away from Jerusalem.

⁽³²⁾ See J. COPPENS, "L'imposition des mains dans les Actes des Apôtres", *Les Actes*, 405-438.

7. *Confronting the one who commercialized the gift* (2 Kgs 5,25-27; Acts 8,20-23).

When Gehazi returns from his money-making expedition, he is first confronted and then irretrievably condemned. Simon also is confronted, but, in a typically Lukan twist, his condemnation is not irretrievable. He is given a chance to repent.

(a) *The confrontation, stage one* (2 Kgs 5,25-26a; Acts 8,20-21).

In making money from the gift, Gehazi took a deviant journey. Without telling Elisha, he went after Naaman. And when, on his return, Elisha asked him where he had been, he denied that he had taken any such journey, denied, as he put it, that he had gone “hither or thither” (*entha kai entha*).

But Elisha contradicted him by telling him that his heart, Elisha’s, had been on the journey with him. In other words, his heart knew that Gehazi had, in fact, gone hither and thither.

In Acts, Peter confronts Simon by telling him that his heart is not straight before God.

Luke’s text involves several adaptations. First, there is internalization. In place of a deviant journey, a process of going hither and thither, Luke depicts a deviousness or crookedness which is within.

Second, there is fusion. Instead of depicting a *heart* which is aware of *crookedness*, Luke speaks of *crookedness of heart*. (Obviously the two adaptations are closely interwoven. It is through the fusion, by bringing together the ideas of heart and crookedness, that Luke achieves internalization: crookedness of heart.)

Third, there appears to be word-play:

OT: Οὐ πεπόρευται ὁ δοῦλός σου ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα

Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδιά μου ἐπορεύθη μετὰ σοῦ

Nt: ἡ γὰρ καρδιά σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεῖα ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ

Thus, the wording of Gehazi’s lie about his movements — he did not go *entha kai entha* — has apparently been adapted to describe the internal crookedness of Simon’s heart: it is not *eutheia enanti* God. Similar word-play may be seen in Luke’s reworking of 2 Kings 4,1-37⁽³³⁾.

⁽³³⁾ See BRODIE, “Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization”, 473.

A further detail needs to be noted. Here, as in the Naboth story⁽³⁴⁾, there occurs the distinction between the source of Luke's *raw material* and the source of his *wording*. Luke's raw material, his basic elements (the heart; deviousness) come from 2 Kgs 5, but the wording which he employs ("your heart is not straight before God"), the wording through which he achieves fusion, internalization and word-play, that wording comes, to a considerable degree, from the Psalms (cf. Ps 77,37, LXX: "Their heart [is] not straight with him [God]"). Luke, of course, adapts the line, especially by changing "straight with", *eutheia met'*, to "straight before", *eutheia enanti*, and it is through such changes that he maintains greater continuity with 2 Kgs 5. The essential point, however, is that the text closest to Luke's wording is not necessarily a reliable guide to the origin of his raw material, to his basic source.

Apart from the three adaptations already noted, it should also be mentioned that while the OT does not articulate the nature of Gehazi's crime — it simply describes it and leaves the process of articulation to the reader — the NT, through Peter's words, is much more clear and explicit: "... because you thought to buy the gift of God with money" (Acts 8,21).

There is yet another detail which is worth noting, but which seems difficult to evaluate. Gehazi brings his money to a place that is secret or dark (*eis to skoteinon*, "to the dark", 2 Kgs 5,24). And Peter tells Simon and his money to go to perdition (*eis apōleian*, Acts 8,20). It could be argued, given Luke's general practices, that perdition is a kind of vivid internalization of the enigmatic dark place. But it is hard to be sure.

(b) *The confrontation, stage two* (2 Kgs 5,26c-27; Acts 8,22-23).

In the final stage of the OT confrontation, Gehazi is allowed to keep his ill-gotten gains, but he is told that Naaman's leprosy will cling to him and his seed forever.

In the NT scene, Simon is exhorted to prayerful repentance, and he is described as being in the grip of sin (literally, "in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity").

The text of Acts shows typical Lukan adaptations. Instead of allowing the culprit to persevere in his sinfulness (to keep the ill-

⁽³⁴⁾ See BRODIE, "The Accusing... of Naboth", 427.

gotten goods), Luke, who tends to emphasize the forgiveness of sins⁽³⁵⁾, depicts an exhortation to prayerful repentance.

And instead of foreseeing a clinging malady which is physical ("the leprosy... will cling to you... for ever"), Peter sees a gripping malady which is internal ("I see you as being in... the bond of iniquity").

It is worth noting that the idea of Elisha as a seer, as one who sees and foresees — an idea which in the OT text is merely implied — is brought out rather more clearly in the NT text. Peter is depicted as one who sees ("I see you as being...").

Here, again, incidentally, there is a distinction between the source of Luke's basic raw material and the source of his wording. The basic raw material, the idea of being in the grip of a powerful negative force, comes from 2 Kgs 5, from the reference to the clinging leprosy. But Luke's wording, concerning the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity, the wording through which he achieves a process of internalization, comes to a considerable degree from fusing other OT texts (cf. Deut 29,17; Isa 58,6).

8. *The chariot* (cf. 2 Kgs 5,8-9.20-21.26; Acts 8,28-30.38).

As already seen, most of the later part of 2 Kgs 5 deals with Gehazi, and has been used as source material for depicting the Simon episode. However, it contains two references to Naaman's chariot (Gehazi's running after it, and Naaman's returning from it to meet Gehazi), and these two references have been adapted, not to the Simon text, but to the text concerning the Ethiopian. This causes a disturbance in the order of the correspondences between the texts, but it makes sense. It means that the three references to the chariot are all adapted to the person most likely to have a chariot, the Ethiopian official.

Comparison of the two texts shows, not only that both refer three times to a chariot, but that — as already partly indicated — the surrounding contexts have significant similarities. The OT speaks of: (1) approaching in a chariot and standing; (2) running after a chariot and returning from it; (3) returning from a chariot. The NT refers to: (1) returning in a chariot; (2) approaching a char-

⁽³⁵⁾ See J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB; Garden City, NY 1981) 223-224.

iot and running towards it; (3) ordering a chariot to stand. In other words, the three NT references consist largely of a reshaping of the three OT texts. The similarity of wording is more evident in Greek:

- | | | |
|-----|---------|---|
| OT: | (8-9) | ἐλθέτω... πρὸς... καὶ ἦλθεν... ἐν... ἄρματι καὶ ἔστη |
| | (20-21) | δραμοῦμαι... καὶ... τρέχοντα ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρματος... αὐτοῦ |
| | (26) | ἐπέστρεψεν... ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρματος |
| NT: | (28) | ὑποστρέφων... ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος αὐτοῦ |
| | (29-30) | πρόσελθε... τῷ ἄρματι... προσδραμῶν |
| | (38) | στῆναι τὸ ἄρμα |

This verbal similarity has a number of unique features. First, though the word “chariot,” which occurs only four times in the NT (three times in Acts 8 and once in Rev 9,9), is fairly common in the LXX (about 170 times), there is no other biblical passage in which the word occurs three times, and three times only, in the singular. (The one possible exception is 2 Kings 10, but even there the first reference to “chariot” [cf. 2 Kgs 10,2], though grammatically singular, is always understood to indicate a plural sense.)

Second, there is no other reference in the LXX to anyone in a chariot coming to a stand (or simply coming to stand). (The nearest thing to it are the references to Ahab remaining or standing [*hestēkōs*] in his chariot [1 Kgs 22,35; 2 Chr 18,34].)

Third, there are no other references to returning in or from a chariot. (Something quite close to it may be found in the fact that Samuel turned his chariot [*epestrepsen to harma*, 1 Sam 15,12], and in the fact that Josiah did not turn aside in his chariot [*ouk apestrepsen... epi to harma...*, 1 Esdr 1,26].)

Fourth, there is no other reference to running towards or after a chariot. (The next nearest thing are three references to organized groups who run *ahead* of chariots [1 Sam 8,11; 2 Sam 15,1; 1 Kgs 1,5].)

Even if each of these features occurred, say, five or six times in both the OT and NT, the fact that they all occur in the texts under discussion would link those texts in a very striking way. The fact that, for all practical purposes, none of them occurs anywhere else, means that the similarity is quite extraordinary.

V. Weighing the evidence

In the preceding analysis the connections between the texts range from some that are clear and strong to others that are subtle or weak. The discovering and assessing of such data is a delicate art, one which, as yet, is not very developed⁽³⁶⁾. What is important, *provided there is strong evidence*, is not to allow what is strong to be obscured by what is weak. Insistence on what is weak, either by the one presenting the argument, or by someone questioning it, obscures the central question: Is there strong evidence, evidence which goes well beyond the range of coincidence?

In the texts under consideration there seems to be sufficient strong evidence to indicate that Luke made direct use of 2 Kgs 5. First, there is an extrinsic plausibility — Luke's kinship with rhetoric and rhetorical imitation, his special awareness of the Naaman story (Luke 4,27), and his previous use of other parts of the Elijah-Elisha narrative, particularly in the Stephen story. Second, there are the intrinsic similarities of the texts, similarities which range from broad themes to tiny details, similarities which, in many cases, cannot be accounted for by coincidence. And, third, the dissimilarities, great though they are, are generally understandable. To a significant degree they may be accounted for through some of imitation's most basic and coherent processes of adaptation. Thus the pattern which emerges is so complex and coherent that deliberate artistry — direct literary dependence — seems to be the only way to account for it.

Luke's narrative does not depend on 2 Kgs 5 alone. Several elements of his text seem quite independent of it. And at every stage Luke is using vocabulary and concepts which reflect a specifically Christian background. 2 Kgs 5, therefore, provides, not a complete explanation of Acts 8,9-40, but a starting-point, a skeleton or foundation. It is one component.

Luke's use of 2 Kgs 5 does not necessarily mean that his text contains no factual history. The presence alone of Simon, a rather well-known historical figure, is a reliable indication that elements of history have been woven into the text. But it does not seem possi-

⁽³⁶⁾ On the problem of assessing data regarding complex literary relationships, see BRODIE, "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization", 479-482.

ble, at least for the moment, clearly to distinguish those elements. In the case of the Ethiopian, for instance, account must be taken not only of the use of the Naaman story, but also of the fact that the text has been so shaped that it maintains fairly close narrative continuity with the Emmaus story. It is difficult in such a situation to unravel what is strictly historical. It seems better, therefore, at this point, to say of the stories of Simon and the Ethiopian what J. Fitzmyer said of Luke 1-2: "Whatever historical matter has been preserved... has been assimilated... to other literary accounts"⁽³⁷⁾.

Luke writes both as a Greco-Roman author and as a Christian narrator and theologian. As a Greco-Roman author, he has followed the widespread practice of grounding his composition on an ancient text. As a Christian narrator and theologian he has re-examined part of his OT heritage and expressed it in a way which is informed by Christian experience and thought, a way which adapts the ancient text to a new age, and which states its meaning with fresh clarity. Thus, he has followed the demands of rhetoric, but he has adapted those demands to the basic Christian idea that the OT should not be destroyed, but fulfilled. In his own way, at a literary as well as a theological level, he has achieved part of the early Christian ideal of blending what was Greek and Jewish into one.

As for the long quest for the sources of Acts, this has consisted essentially of a search for specifically Christian sources, sources originating in the first century, and the detection of Luke's use of some OT texts leaves that central issue quite unresolved. But it casts light on it. It suggests, most obviously, that, in some areas of Acts, the specifically Christian sources have been closely interwoven with an OT foundation. It also suggests that those sources have been thoroughly reworked, that they have been adapted in accordance with some of the procedures of imitation. It further suggests that, as far as sources are concerned, the stories of Stephen and Philip (Acts 6-8) are closely linked. At least they both use basic components from the Elijah-Elisha narrative. By the same token, it raises a doubt about Harnack's distinction of sources, or at least about the fact that he assigned the Stephen story to the Antioch source, and the Philip story to the Jerusalem-Caesarea source.

(37) FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 309.

However, though the evidence is interesting, it is extremely incomplete. Rather than attempt to make much of it, it seems better to wait, and, in the meantime, to search for evidence that may be more decisive.

Aquinas Institute
3642 Lindell Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63108

Thomas L. BRODIE, O.P.

SOMMAIRE

Le récit que Luc fait de l'histoire de Simon et de l'Ethiopien (Ac 8,9-40) est largement modelé, mais pas exclusivement, sur l'histoire de Naaman et de Gehazi (2 R 5). Le renouvellement *physique* de Naaman — la purification de sa lèpre — a été adapté afin de constituer une base pour la description du renouvellement *intérieur* de l'Ethiopien — sa purification par le baptême. La vénalité de Gehazi — il voulait recevoir de l'argent pour le don de Dieu — a été adaptée pour décrire la vénalité plus spirituelle de Simon — il voulait recevoir le don de Dieu (l'esprit) contre de l'argent. Le procédé de Luc suit les usages littéraires gréco-romains de l'imitation rhétorique, spécialement celui de l'incorporation de textes anciens. Tels sont les indices qui appuient cette hypothèse: (1) l'affinité générale de Luc pour les méthodes littéraires gréco-romaines. (2) Sa tendance à utiliser et imiter la LXX. (3) Les similitudes prononcées, à la fois complexes et cohérentes, entre les textes en question.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Nota sobre Prov 30,19 (w'derek geber b'almāh)

Dentro del Libro de los Proverbios la sección 30,1-33 constituye una unidad autónoma, que por tradición (*dibrē 'āgūr*) y forma literaria (proverbio numérico) manifiesta una clara ascendencia cananea⁽¹⁾. En el interior de tal complejo redaccional los vv. 18-19 (20) presentan un proverbio numérico de neta estructura: a) cláusula numérica (3/4), b) enumeración paralelístico-climática (?) de 4 elementos, c) desarrollo explicativo, probablemente de tipo glosa⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ O bien se distinguen dos unidades originalmente autónomas: 1-14 (*'Āgūr*), 15-31(-33) (*'lūqāh*). Para su encuadramiento literario cf. las introducciones generales al Antiguo Testamento y los comentarios *ad locum*, por ejemplo: H. RINGGREN, *Sprüche* (ATD 16; Göttingen 1962); D. BUZY, «Les machals numériques de la sangsue et de l'almah», *RB* 42 (1933) 5-13; Y. KOLLER, «Paralelos a Proverbios 30-31» (hb.), *BethM* 21 (1975-1976) 551-556; C. H. TOY, *Proverbs* (ICC; Edinburgh 1899 [reimp. 1959]); A. BARUCQ, *Le Livre des Proverbs* (SB; Paris 1964); R. B. V. SCOTT, *Proverbs. Ecclesiastes* (AB 18; Garden City, N.Y. 1965); W. MCKANE, *Proverbs: A New Approach* (Old Testament Library Series; Philadelphia 1970); R. N. WHYBRAY, *The Book of Proverbs* (The Cambridge Bible Commentary on the NEB; Cambridge 1972); J. J. SERRANO, *Proverbios* (La Sagrada Escritura IV; Madrid 1969); O. PLÖGER, *Sprüche Salomos* (Proverbial) (BKAT XVII; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984); L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL-J. VILCHEZ, *Sapienciales I. Proverbios* (NBE, Comentario teológico y literario; Madrid 1984). Sobre la estructura del proverbio numérico cf. G. SAUER, *Die Sprüche Agurs* (BWANT V, 4; Stuttgart 1963) 64-91, 106-107; S. GEVIRTZ, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel* (Chicago 1963 [reimp. 1973]) 15-24; y la bibliografía citada en G. DEL OLMO LETE, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaán según la tradición de Ugarit* (Madrid 1981) 61, n. 90; además: Y. ZAKOVITCH, «For Three... and for Four». *The Pattern of the Numerical Sequence Three-Four in the Bible* (Jerusalem 1979 [hb.]) 370, 478, 481-482; H. P. RÜGER, «Die gestaffelten Zahlensprüche des Alten Testaments und aram. Achikar 92», *VT* 31 (1981) 229-234; Y. AVISHUR, «Numerical Parallels in the Bible and in the Semitic Literature of the Ancient Near East» (hb.), *Proceedings of the 7th World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem 1981) II, 1-9.

⁽²⁾ El carácter «glosador» de v. 20 es generalmente admitido por todos los comentaristas (cf. nota precedente). Puede verse igualmente a este propósito A. B. EHRLICH, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (Leipzig 1913 [reimp. Hildesheim 1968]) 172. Este lugar no es, en cambio, considerado en los estudios textuales sobre el Libro de los Proverbios de G. R. DRIVER, «Problems in the Hebrew Text of Proverbs», *Bib* 32 (1951) 173-197; D. W. THOMAS, «Textual and philological notes on some passages in the Book of Proverbs», *VTS* 3 (1955) 280-292; W. MCKANE, «Textual and Philological Notes on the Book of Proverbs...», *Glasg-UnOrSocTr* 24 (1971-1972) 76-90; C. I. K. STORY, «The Book of Proverbs and the Northwest Semitic Literature», *JBL* 64 (1945) 319-337; M. DAHOOD, *Proverbs*

Nuestra atención se va a centrar en el v. 19. Aquí la cuádruple mención de *derek* define el significativo básico objeto de la maravilla del sabio: un camino que se sigue sin estar trazado, «que se hace al andar», como diría el poeta⁽³⁾. La estructura del primer par es estrictamente paralela por lo que a los elementos variables se refiere: sujeto animal del camino (águila/serpiente), espacio de su marcha (cielo/suelo rocoso). En el segundo par, en cambio, este paralelismo se desfigura, de acuerdo con la interpretación corriente: sujeto humano del camino (barco, en cuanto artilugio guiado por hombres/hombrevarón), espacio de su marcha (el mar abierto/la doncella). En el cuarto elemento de la enumeración *derek* pierde, además, su valor semántico de «ruta física de marcha» para asumir otro antropológico de «comportamiento o relación sexual»⁽⁴⁾. Este desequilibrio semántico y paralelístico podría estar motivado por el carácter normalmente climático de estas enumeraciones, conforme al cual el último miembro se destaca con un valor nuevo e interpretativo hacia el que tienden los elementos previos de la enumeración, que adquieren así valor subsidiario e incluso meramente simbólico⁽⁵⁾.

Sin embargo, esta explicación resulta invalidada por el específico sentido aclimático, en cuanto al nivel semántico se refiere, que las enumeraciones manifiestan en los restantes casos dentro de esta sección: en todos ellos los elementos aducidos, de acuerdo con la cláusula numérica, mantienen un mis-

and Northwest Semitic Philology (Roma 1963); W. A. VAN DER WEIDEN, *Le Livre des Proverbes. Notes philologiques* (BibOr 23; Rome 1970). Para el análisis hermenéutico pueden consultarse los estudios de U. SKLADNY, *Die ältesten Spruchsammlungen in Israel* (Göttingen 1962); J. CONRAD, «Die neue Gliederung der Proverbien», *ZAW* 79 (1967) 67-76; H. J. HERMISSON, *Studien zur israelitischen Spruchliteratur* (WMANT 28; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968); O. PLÖGER, «Zur Auslegung der Sentenzen-Sammlungen des Proverbienbuchs», *Probleme biblischer Theologie* (FS. G. von Rad; [Hrsg. H. W. WOLFF] München 1971) 402-416.

⁽³⁾ Paralela a la de «camino no trazado» es la noción de «senda sin rastro», que aquí entienden muchos autores y que leyó el glosador de v. 20. Pero se trata de un sentido deducido y menos «maravilloso», además de no ser completamente exacto, pues la serpiente puede dejar huella, el barco estela y el rastro del varón es obvio; cf. SCOTT, *Proverbs*, 181; SERRANO, *Proverbios*, 522; PLÖGER, *Sprüche*, 364; ZAKOVITCH, «*For Three...*», 482.

⁽⁴⁾ «Físicamente» ese comportamiento tiene también su «camino» (cf. hb. *bô'* 'el como expresión de la relación sexual). Por eso se suele poner la «maravilla» en el resultado, en la procreación (cf. EHRLICH, *Randglossen*, 172; SCOTT, *Proverbs*, 181), pero de esa manera se destruye la congruencia metafórica.

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. G. VON RAD, *La sabiduría en Israel* (Actualidad Bíblica 31 [tr.]; Madrid 1973) 163-164; ZAKOVITCH, «*For Three...*», 481-482, 506, 527; W. G. E. WATSON, «The Ahiqar Sayings: Some Marginal Comments», *AuOr* 2 (1984) 253-261 («delayed explication»). Para la estructura del *climax* en las enumeraciones ugaríticas, cf. DEL OLMO LETE, *Mitos y Leyendas*, 61; en ellas el último miembro se destaca sintácticamente, manteniendo por lo demás el mismo nivel semántico. Los tratados clásicos y modernos de poética hebrea destacan este fenómeno; cf. p.e. entre los últimos J. L. KUGEL, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry. Parallelism and its History* (New Haven, CT 1981) 42-45; W. G. E. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry. A Guide to its Techniques* (Sheffield 1984) 148-149; asimismo la bibliografía citada en la n. 1 acerca del proverbio numérico, en particular W. M. W. ROTH, *Numerical Sayings in the Old Testament. A Form-Critical Study* (VTS 13; Leiden 1965) 21-23.

mo nivel de lenguaje referencial objetivo-físico, normalmente en paralelismo semántico. Así, por ejemplo, vv. 15-16: el Sheol, la vulva estéril, la tierra reseca, el fuego (insaciables); vv. 21-23; el rey esclavizado, el necio hartado, la malquerida desposada, la esclava heredera (inaguantables); vv. 24-28: la hormiga, el *šāpān*, la langosta, la *šmāmūt* (pequeños y sabios); vv. 29-31: el león, el gallo, el chivo, el rey (?) (apuestos)⁽⁶⁾. Fuera ya de esta sección puede verse: 6,16-19: ojos altivos, lengua mendaz, manos sangrientas, corazón avieso, pies descarriados, falso testigo, tipo cizañero (aborrecibles). En todos estos casos el carácter climático o no se da o resulta muy tenue; en cambio, la identidad del nivel referencial del lenguaje es bastante clara.

Naturalmente, siempre es posible en un análisis semántico «descubrir» un proceso climático en estos dichos numéricos, partiendo del supuesto de que tiene que darse en ellos. Pero esto no tiene por qué ser así, si se atiende al carácter enfático-acumulativo que el paralelismo tiene de por sí. Un desbordamiento climático puede desde luego darse y se da con frecuencia, sobre todo en enumeraciones impares en las que el último elemento «sobresale» de la serie paralelística. Pero ésta ya en sí misma es «climática» por su propia insistencia y acumulación semántica. En el fondo requerir como necesario el climatismo expreso y diferenciado del último miembro de la serie equivale a ignorar el valor climático ascendente de toda ella a partir del primero. En ese sentido sí que cabe asegurar que el último es siempre climático: en cuanto culmina el proceso de acumulación y énfasis, no porque tenga que destacarse del campo semántico referencial de la serie, como acontece en la versión corriente de Prov 30,19. En ese sentido el mantenimiento de la homogeneidad del campo semántico dentro de la estructura paralelística, sobre todo del significante básico, *derek* en este caso, se puede asumir como punto de partida legítimo, tocando el *onus probandi* a la hipótesis que suponga su transformación.

Teniendo en cuenta estos datos morfocríticos, cabría reexaminar el valor semántico otorgado al último elemento de la enumeración presente en 30,19, manteniendo para *derek* también allí el sentido objetivo-físico de «camino (no trazado)» y otorgando a *'almāh* un significado paralelo a *leb-yām*. Entendido este sintagma como «alta mar, mar abierta», donde no hay camino trazado para la nave, refleja el carácter impenetrable, misterioso, oculto del medio por el que aquélla se desliza, incluso con una connotación de «interioridad, envoltura, ocultamiento» (*leb*)⁽⁷⁾. En este sentido *'almāh* podría estar en relación con la base *glm I*, para la que el valor «ocultar, oscurecer» es normal en hebreo, tanto en formas verbales (*ne'lam*, *he'lim*) como nomi-

(6) El v. 31 ofrece un texto corrompido, posiblemente el «rey» está fuera de lugar; cf. TOY, *Proverbs*, 535-537; EHRICH, *Randglossen*, 173; DRIVER, «Problems...», 194; THOMAS, «Textual and Philological Notes», 291; ZAKOVITCH, «For Three...», 284-285; este autor reconoce explícitamente el carácter no necesariamente climático de esta estructura numérica, como aparece claro en varios de los ejemplos citados (cf. *ibidem.*, 488, 495, 505).

(7) Cf. Ez 27,27. Pero no cabe insistir en este aspecto, dado el carácter lexicalizado de la expresión preposicional.

nales (*ta'ālūmah*)⁽⁸⁾. Concretamente en Sal 44,22 se utiliza esta última forma en combinación sintagmática con *lēb* (*ta'ālūmôt lēb*), que recuerda el desdoblamiento paralelístico de nuestro texto. Todo ello nos llevaría a otorgar aquí a *'almāh*, leyendo quizá una forma nominal-verbal de tipo *quīl* (*'olmāh*), el valor semántico de «ocultamiento, oscuridad», quizá «tiniebla», o mejor aún, dada la «objetividad» de los otros términos de referencia (cielo, peña, mar), «lugar oculto, oscuro»⁽⁹⁾.

Ahora bien, esta interpretación, lograda desde el análisis semántico del propio texto hebreo y sin salir de la lexicografía de esta lengua, encuentra apoyo en la literatura ugarítica. Aquí tenemos *glmt* en relación sintagmática con *ym* y en paralelismo con *złmt* (hb. *šalmāwet/šalmôt*), «oscuridad, tiniebla»: *bglmt 'mm ym bn złmt...*, «en oscuridad está envuelto el mar, en densa tiniebla...», (KTU I. 4 VII 54-55 = UT 51 VII 54-55)⁽¹⁰⁾. El contexto hace posiblemente referencia al caos primordial, personificado en el dios *Yammu*, el «Mar», por lo que es legítimo atribuir a *glmt* el valor de «oscuridad tenebrosa, tempestad», atendido el mencionado paralelismo⁽¹¹⁾. No deja de sorprender la coincidencia lexicográfica del citado texto ugarítico con Prov 30, 19⁽¹²⁾.

(8) En cambio, el valor «cubrir», que presenta también la base árabe *galima*, resulta sólo válido en sentido sexual y deriva de *glm II*, de donde igualmente arrancan los conocidos lexemas por «mancebo» y «doncella»; cf. E. W. LANE, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (London 1863 [reimp. 1968]) VI, 2286.

(9) Cf. a este propósito el n. 1. *'alemet* («¿escondite?»), posiblemente de la misma base; F. BROWN-S. R. DRIVER-CH. A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1966) 761. Por otra parte, el tema del «camino en la noche (*laylāh*)/oscuridad (*hōšek*)» y su terror no es infrecuente en la Biblia hebrea; cf. p.e. Sal 35,6: *y'hi-darkām hōšek...*; Prov 2,13: *lāleket b'darkē-hōšek* (sentido moral). Una simple consulta de las Concordancias puede corroborar este extremo. El tema tiene unas claras connotaciones escatológicas (/Sheol), que confirmarían la sugerencia avanzada en n. 11; cf. N. J. TROMP, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament* (BibOr 21; Roma 1969) 140-144.

(10) Este texto fragmentario se completa según el paralelo KTU 1.8:7-8, de manera que es textualmente seguro, aunque su interpretación resulte controvertida; cf. DEL OLMO LETE, *Mitos y Leyendas*, 130, 210.

(11) La interpretación de este lexema en el texto citado es hoy día segura, superada la alternativa que veía aquí la mención de una diosa, retomada últimamente por DIJKSTRA, *UF* 15 (1983) 29-30; pero cf. H. L. GINSBERG, *The Legend of King Keret* (New Haven, Ct 1946) 27, 45; J. GRAY, *The Legacy of Canaan* (VTS 5; Leiden 1965) 54, n. 5; J. C. DE MOOR, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu According to the Version of Ilmilku* (AOAT 16; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1971) 172; A. CAQUOT-M. SZNYCER, *Textes ougaritiques. Tome I. Mythes et Légendes* (LAPO 7; Paris 1974) I, 219, n.w. Gray y Caquot-Szzyner piensan en bases alófonas *glm/zlm*. Se puede incluso apreciar una resonancia infernal-ctónica, según De Moor; así también, B. MARGALIT, *A Matter of «Life» and «Death»* (AOAT 206; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1980) 31-32; P. XELLA, *Testi rituali di Ugarit I* (Roma 1981) 30. En este sentido adviértase la secuencia de ámbitos del «camino»: cielo/peña (tierra)/mar/-, que «lógicamente» haría pensar en una última referencia al «infierno».

(12) Hicimos ya mención de ello en nuestro estudio publicado en *AuOr* 2 (1984) 18.

Asimismo, en la enumeración de las causas de exterminio de la familia del rey Kirta se nos dice que *mdtū glm ym*, «una sexta parte (se la cosechó) el Prócer Yammu» (KTU 1.14 I 19-20 = UT Krt 19-20). La interpretación de la frase es controvertida. Una versión ve aquí la denominación mitológica del «Mar» (el Prócer Yammu)⁽¹³⁾ o de su(s) servidor(es)⁽¹⁴⁾, mientras otra lee en *glm* la mentada base *glm I* con el valor nominal «oscuridad»⁽¹⁵⁾ o verbal «cubrir, tragar»⁽¹⁶⁾. Esta última interpretación es verosímil y favorece la semántica aquí propuesta de hb. 'almāh en Prov 30,19, pero yo prefiero, en razón de la estructura sintáctica, ver en *glm* del texto ugarítico citado una denominación de Yammu (*glm II*) y otorgar el valor de «oscuridad», «lugar oscuro», a la citada forma *glmt* (*glm I*), paralela de hb. 'o/almāh⁽¹⁷⁾. Una tercera interpretación relaciona este *glm* con *glm II*, ar. *galima*, en su forma VIII, 'ig'alamā, «estar excitado, encrespado» (dicho del oleaje del mar), y traduce el sintagma *glm ym* por «el oleaje/olas del mar»⁽¹⁸⁾. Tal interpretación no ha encontrado eco, y con razón; hemos de desecharla, aunque sería muy favorable a nuestro propósito, al proporcionarnos un perfecto paralelismo sinónimo (mar/oleaje)⁽¹⁹⁾.

Adviértase, por otro lado, que *geber* no posee en hebreo en general, ni en

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. DEL OLMO LETE, *Mitos y Leyendas*, 290, 607; F. CH. FENSHAM, «Remarks on Certain Difficult Passages in Keret», JNSL 1 (1971) 20.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Así De Moor, Fensham y Margalit en las obras citadas, entre otros; últimamente P. XELLA, *Gli antenati di dio* (Verona 1982) 158. U. CASSUTO, *Biblical and Oriental Studies* (Jerusalén 1975) II, 208, se apoya en la misma base, pero con una semántica propia («violencia del mar»). Una connotación mitológica (Yammu/su servidor) sería difícilmente justificable, dada la «objetividad» de los demás referentes; cf. además *infra* n. 19.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. J. GRAY, *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra* (Leiden 1964) 11, 33 (siguiendo a Gaster); M. DIETRICH-O. LORETZ, «Der Prolog des KRT-Epos (CTA 14 I 1-35)», *Wort und Geschichte* (Fs. K. Elliger [Hrsg. H. Gese-H. P. RÜGER]; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1973) 32, 34 (cf. WO 4 [1967-1968] 308).

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. GINSBERG, *The Legend of King Keret*, 14, 34; L. BADRE *et al.*, «Notes ougaritiques I. Keret», *Syria* 53 (1976) 101-102.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ni que decir tiene que existe en ambas lenguas un homógrafo *glmt*-*'almāh*, «doncella»; cf. *supra* n. 8. Incluso tenemos en fenicio (KAI 24:8) el par *'lmt/ gbr*; cf. VELLO SALO, *Phönizisch-Hebräische Wortpaare* (Dis. Roma 1975) 132; Y. AVISHUR *Ktūbōt pinikiyyōt w'hammiqrā* (Jerusalem 1979) I, 40. No se recoge en cambio en ID., *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures* (ADAT 210; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) II (ch. 2 «Pairs Common to Phoenician and the Bible»). No es en realidad un par estricto del punto de vista del paralelismo, al menos en hebreo; en fenicio es probablemente par poético en un contexto de transacción comercial. Cf. T. COLLINS, «The Kilamuwa Inscription - A Phoenician Poem», *WO* 6 (1971) 183-188.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. J. AISTLEITNER, *Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Shamra* (Budapest 1964) 89; ID., *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (Berlin 1974) 248; M. MAROTH, «Bemerkungen zum ugaritischen Text Keret», *ActOr-Hung* 27 (1973) 306-307. Pero la «excitación» que connota la base en árabe es ante todo «sexual»; cf. *supra* n. 8.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Pero en el proverbio numérico el paralelismo no puede ser «sinónimo», sino que los elementos enumerados deben ser objetivamente distintos («tres cosas...»).

el Libro de los Proverbios en concreto, una peculiar connotación «sexual», sino más bien la de «fuerza, valentía, arrojo», de acuerdo con el sema fundamental de la base *gbr*, ar. *ġabara*⁽²⁰⁾. En este mismo contexto (Prov 30,1. 19.23.30) las diversas formas de la base *gbr* no manifiestan connotación «sexual» especial, sino más bien cualificación de «poder» o «prestigio» (*geber*, *ġbîrâh*, *ġibbôr*).

Es cierto, sin embargo, que las versiones modernas son unánimes en la interpretación «sexual» de la expresión («el camino/rastro del hombre/varón en la doncella»)⁽²¹⁾. Las antiguas, al contrario, no estaban tan seguras; en realidad la excluyen. Así la LXX lee *kai 'odoûs 'andròs 'en neótēti*, seguida por la Peshitta (*b'lymwith*), la Vetus Latina y la Vulgata (*in adolescentia*)⁽²²⁾; buen testimonio de que la interpretación moderna, la más obvia desde el punto de vista de la lexicografía tradicional, se percibía extraña e inadecuada. No obstante, también esas versiones cambian el sentido objetivo-físico de *derek*. Ya en este momento el supuesto valor semántico de *'o/almâh*, «oscuridad», se había perdido.

Esta pérdida indujo, quizá, la glosa del v. 20, con la que se introduce en la enumeración un «quinto» elemento de «conducta» (*derek*) sexual-moral (adulterio), que aparentemente no acarrea consecuencias a la que lo comete. También podría ser que tal glosa hubiera inducido el olvido del valor propio de *'almâh* en este caso. De todas las maneras, nada tiene que ver con el proverbio numérico de vv. 18-19, perfectamente definido en sí mismo.

En razón, pues, de: a) la coherencia semántica-estructural de la forma literaria; b) el valor básico y contextual de *ġlm/ġlmt* en semítico nor-occidental; c) la confirmación aportada por los lugares ugaríticos citados; d) la correlación que en hebreo y ugarítico se aprecia entre *ym* y la base *ġlm I*, me atrevo a proponer la siguiente versión de Prov 30,18-19:

«Tres cosas me maravillan
y cuatro no llego a entender:

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 149-150; D. COHEN, *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques* (Paris 1976) 97. En hebreo bíblico tardío es sinónimo de *'ādām* (cf. Lam 3,35-36; Dn 8,15), como en fenicio («hombre libre») y arameo.

⁽²¹⁾ Así RST, NEB, BJ, DHORME, BUBER, NBE; cf. a este propósito la deliciosa efusión lírica de L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Proverbios y Eclesiástico* (Los Libros Sagrados; Madrid 1968) 131; y luego en *Proverbios* (1984), 517-518. Retienen los autores de este comentario el carácter climático del cuarto elemento y el doble sentido de *derek*. No advierten, sin embargo, que en el tercer elemento está ya presente el hombre (nave).

⁽²²⁾ El más ambiguo resulta el Targum, dada la fluctuación de la escritura aramea: P. DE LAGARDE, *Hagiographa Chaldaice* (Osnabrück 1873 [reimp. 1967]) 143 (*b'wlymt'*); la Políglota de Walton lee *b'lm'* (*in virgine*); en cambio, el Targum preparado por Alfonso de Zamora para la Complutense, *b'wlymt* (*in adolescentia*); cf. L. DIEZ MERINO, *Targum de Proverbios*. Edición Príncipe (Biblioteca Hispana Bíblica 11; Madrid 1984) 48, 199, 238. Una investigación de los desarrollos midrásicos podría ser interesante.

el camino del águila en el cielo,
el camino de la culebra en la peña,
el camino del barco en alta mar
y el camino del (hombre) valiente en la oscuridad».

Facultad de Filología
Dep. de Hebreo y Arameo
Universidad de Barcelona
08007 Barcelona

Gregorio DEL OLMO LETE

Renaming and Wedding Imagery in Isaiah 62

Renaming is an important theme in Isaiah 62. In v. 2, Zion is to be given a new name by the Lord. In v. 4, two negative designations are replaced by two positive names. At the end of the chapter in v. 12, two more pairs of names are mentioned: one pair for the people and one pair for the city.

In order to ascertain the significance of the renaming in this passage, we need to relate it to the social significance of renaming in Israelite culture. First of all, there are numerous cases recorded of the renaming of cities or places. This can be in association with an event which occurred there (e.g. Gen 35,6-7). Most typically the city is renamed by its conqueror (Num 32,41-42; Judg 18,29; cf. 2 Sam 12,28). It may also be renamed when it is rebuilt (Num 32,37-38), which may have some relevance for our present passage.

Since in Isaiah 62 Zion is clearly personified, it is important to also look at situations in which persons are renamed⁽¹⁾. Generally such renaming is associated with a change in the status or condition of the person receiving the new name. The giving of the new name can be a sign that the receiver of the name is coming under the authority of the giver of the name. Thus Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah were given new names by the chief official when they were recruited for training for the king's service (Dan 1,7). Similarly the Pharaoh gave Joseph a new name when he recruited him to be his viceroy (Gen 41,45). It is possible in these cases that there is also an element of 'naturalization' — so that one does not have a foreign-sounding name (cf. Esth 2,7). In 2 Kgs 23,34 and 24,17 we see two examples of people being renamed with throne-names by a suzerain at the time they are established as king. The renaming is a sign of the authority of the suzerain over the vassal king, as well as being associated with their new kingly status.

In all these cases, the actual meaning of the name may or may not be significant. It has been suggested that the renaming of Mattaniah as Zedekiah embodied a warning from the suzerain that the vassal should practise righteousness (*šedeq*)⁽²⁾. On the other hand, Mishael may have been renamed Meshach simply because of the similar sound⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ For an ancient treatment of this question, see PHILO's tractate, *De mutatione nominum*.

⁽²⁾ J. A. MOTYER, "Name", *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (Sydney 1980) II, 1051.

⁽³⁾ D. J. WISEMAN, "Meshach", *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (Sydney 1980) II, 985.

Another type of renaming is connected with the establishing or confirmation of a covenant between the Lord and the person who is renamed. In so far as the covenant between Yahweh and Israel was similar to ancient suzerainty treaties, there may be a link between this and the giving of throne-names mentioned above. The first example is the renaming of Abram (Gen 17,5) and Sarai (Gen 17,15). The meaning of the new names, Abraham and Sarah, are directly connected to the covenant promises. The names can thus be seen as a sign and guarantee of the covenant. The other example is the renaming of Jacob as Israel (Gen 32,28; 35,10). Again the renaming is accompanied by a recitation of covenant promises.

Yet another situation giving rise to renaming is marriage. Isa 4,1 indicates that upon marriage, the wife would be called by the name of the husband. This does not mean that she no longer used her own name, but that her husband's name was an additional appellation for her. In the other cases discussed above, the intent of the renaming was to terminate the using of the old name and replace it with the new one. In the case of Abram and Jacob, this is made explicit by the use of the formula *lō' . . . 'ôd*: "No longer shall your name be Abram". In some cases, such as Jacob's and Daniel's, the old name continues to compete successfully with the new name, but this does not change the fact that an authentic renaming has taken place.

In contrast to this, however, are cases where a renaming formula is used without any real intent to discontinue the use of the old name. The purpose is rather a dramatic form of predication — to describe forcefully the character and condition of the person renamed. It is the meaning of the new name which is important, not its labelling function. An example of this is Naomi's renaming of herself as *mārā* (Ru 1,20). Such 'symbolic' renaming is not uncommon in the prophets. In many cases it is not clear whether it is really a case of renaming since it is not said that the old name will be discontinued. Of particular interest are a number of cases where Jerusalem is given a symbolic name. Examples are:

Jer 3,17 "Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the LORD".

Jer 33,16 "And this is the name by which it will be called: 'The LORD is our righteousness'".

Ezek 48,35 "And the name of the city henceforth shall be, The LORD is there".

Isa 60,14 "They shall call you the City of the LORD, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel".

In these cases an element of the meaning of the name seems to be indicating ownership or belonging — a common function of naming (cf. Isa 44,5). In contrast, in Isa 1,26 the name indicates the characteristic of the city: "you shall be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city". Other examples of symbolic naming in Isaiah are 58,12: "you shall be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of streets to dwell in", and 60,18: "you shall call your walls Salvation, and your gates Praise". All these namings are connected with the restoration of Jerusalem.

What light does this throw on the renaming in Isaiah 62? Verse 12 is quite similar to the other prophetic symbolic namings. The names for the

people indicate both their characteristics — redeemed and holy — and the fact that they belong to the Lord. The names for Zion indicate her characteristics. Verse 4, however, is rather different in that it uses the *lō'... 'ôd* formula in repudiating old names to be replaced by the new. The fact that the verb *'mr* is used to refer to the old names rather than the usual naming verb *qr'* might suggest that *'āzûbâh* and *šēmāmâh* are not meant to be taken as real names but rather as descriptions. Examples of similar usage of *'mr* are Isa 19,18; 32,5; 61,6; Hos 2,1 (= 1,10)⁽⁴⁾. However the fact that *'āzûbâh* is a real woman's name in 1 Kgs 22,42⁽⁵⁾, and that *'mr* is used similarly with the *lō'... 'ôd* formula in reference to Jacob's name in Gen 32,28, argue against this suggestion. It is likely that the use of *lō'... 'ôd* in Isa 62,4 is a deliberate evocation of the covenantal renaming of Abram and Jacob and gives a hint that the renaming may be connected to the establishment of a covenant with Zion. This suggestion is strengthened by a reference to a covenant with the inhabitants of Zion only a few verses earlier in 61,9.

It is not so easy to find a parallel to the reference to renaming in v. 2. This is the only place in the Old Testament where the expression *šēm ḥadāš* occurs. We need to discern the occasion and significance from the context, but it is not certain which part of the context should be given the most weight. The preceding bicolon refers to nations and kings seeing the righteousness and glory of Zion. This links most strongly to the righteousness mentioned in v. 1b, but may also suggest that the kings and nations are witnesses to the renaming ceremony. The reference to a royal diadem in v. 3 suggests that the renaming may be in connection with a coronation, linking to the giving of throne-names discussed above. It would be plausible that other kings and representatives of nations would be present, invited to witness such a ceremony. This would also explain why the crown is in the Lord's hand. He is in the role of the one who places the crown on the monarch's head, just as the high priest Jehoida put the crown on Josiah's head (2 Kgs 11,12). This is a more natural interpretation than Ibn Ezra's suggestion that the crown is a sort of ornament worn on the arm⁽⁶⁾. Cheyne's suggestion⁽⁷⁾ that the Lord is exhibiting the crown to the admiring world would have some truth in it — since the crown is the center of attention at a coronation ceremony.

Although this interpretation can integrate all the allusions in vv. 2-3, it faces a major problem. At a coronation, the person crowned will also be the person renamed. Yet while Zion is renamed in v. 2, Zion does not receive the crown in v. 3. Rather she *is* the crown. If this is a coronation, with Zion as the crown and the Lord as the one who crowns, who then is crowned?

⁽⁴⁾ For discussion of this pattern see F. I. ANDERSEN-D. N. FREEDMAN, *Hosea* (AB; Garden City 1980) 204.

⁽⁵⁾ For a discussion of the likely origin of this type of name see M. NOTH, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Hildesheim 1966) 231-232.

⁽⁶⁾ IBN EZRA, *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah* (New York 1873) 283.

⁽⁷⁾ T. K. CHEYNE, *The Prophecies of Isaiah* (New York 1895) II, 98.

In order to solve this problem, we need to examine the various possible functions of crowns in the Old Testament. The term *'ăteret*, which occurs in v. 3a, is the most general term. It can be used to refer to a royal crown (Jer 13,18; Ezek 21,26; Ps 21,4; Esth 8,5). It can refer to a tiara as a piece of women's jewelry (Ezek 16,12; 23,42). It is also used as a symbol of glory or honor (Prov 4,9; 14,24; 16,31; 17,6; Job 19,9; 31,36; Lam 5,16). In Isa 28,1.3 it is used figuratively for a city (Samaria) and in 28,5 figuratively for the Lord.

The term *šānīp*, which occurs in v. 3b (*qērē*), likewise can have a connotation of royalty (Zech 3,5), women's ornament (Isa 3,23), or symbol of honor (Job 29,14). In contrast to these, other terms have a more limited semantic range. The term *nēzer* is always connected with authority, either of the king (2 Sam 1,10; 2 Kgs 11,12; Ps 89,40; 132,18) or of the high priest (Exod 29,6; 39,30; Lev 8,9). The term *mišnepet* is used exclusively for the turban or mitre of the high priest (e.g. Exod 28,37). The term *pē'ēr* may refer to priests (Exod 39,28; Ezek 44,13) or to the ornamental headgear of women (Isa 3,20), men (Ezek 24,17), or a bridegroom (Isa 61,10).

This last reference occurs just before our present passage and coupled with the references to marriage in v. 5 gives rise to the possibility that the crown in v. 3 might be connected with a wedding. The most instructive parallel reference is the use of *'ăteret* in connection with a royal wedding in Cant 3,11: "and behold King Solomon, with the crown with which his mother crowned him on the day of his wedding". According to Pope⁽⁸⁾, crowns were worn by both groom and bride at Jewish weddings until A.D. 70. He cites the Rabbinic proverb (*Pirke R. El.* 16): *hātān dōmeh lēmelek*, "a bridegroom is like a king". Cant 3,11 shows that one part of the wedding ceremony (at least in a royal wedding, though probably also in others) was the placing of a crown on the bridegroom's head. If on his wedding day a bridegroom receives two beautiful things — a beautiful crown and a beautiful bride — it would be tempting for a poet to use one as a metaphor of the other. An example of this is provided by Prov 12,4: "A good wife is the crown of her husband". This provides the solution to the problem of vv. 2-3⁽⁹⁾. Zion is the bride at a royal wedding. The renaming of v. 2 may be the renaming of the bride associated with marriage. Since it is a royal wedding the renaming is simultaneously associated with being installed as queen. Esther might possibly be an example of this if Anderson's suggestion⁽¹⁰⁾ is correct, that Esther was the name she received upon her coronation. But it is more likely that she adopted the name earlier as a means to help conceal her nationality (Esth 2,10).

In v. 3 the image changes a little and Zion is seen as the crown which the Lord, as officiator of the marriage, is to place on the bridegroom's head. The reference to *šēnīp mēlūkāh* shows that it is a royal wedding. It is likely that of all the 'crown' vocabulary, *'ăteret* and *šānīp* were chosen since they

⁽⁸⁾ M. H. POPE, *Song of Songs* (AB; Garden City 1977) 448.

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. E. J. YOUNG, *The Book of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids 1972) III, 469.

⁽¹⁰⁾ B. W. ANDERSON, *The Book of Esther*. Introduction and Exegesis (IB; New York-Nashville 1954) III, 841.

are the only terms which can give the double connotation of both royal and ornamental (wedding) crown. The fact that the new names of v. 4b make reference to being married, and to the delight of a bridegroom in a bride, supports this interpretation.

We still need to work out who the bridegroom is. Verse 5 offers two candidates: *bānāyik* and *'ēlōhāyik*. Both possibilities present problems. It seems incongruous for sons to marry their mother. And if God is officiating, how can he also be the bridegroom? In order to put this in perspective it is helpful to look at some of the marriage and family imagery used elsewhere in Isaiah with regard to Zion. The most important passages are 49,14-23 and 54,1-13. The most common image is that of Zion as the mother of sons (49,17-23; 51,17-20; 54,1-2.13; 60,4,9; 66,7-12). In 51,17-20 the calamity which befell Israel is portrayed by a picture of Zion bereft of her sons who lie unconscious in the streets. The return from exile is portrayed by the sons being brought back to their mother (49,17-23; 60,4,9). The restoration of Israel is also portrayed by the picture of Zion giving birth to many children (54,1-3) which happens in a seemingly impossible way: incredibly fast (66,7-9), and while she is a widow (49,19-21). Zion's widowhood is also mentioned in 54,4. In 54,6-9 the widowhood is seen rather as caused by desertion, with the Lord specified as Zion's husband. Zion's restoration is seen in terms of a wife being reconciled to her husband. In 62,5 the restoration is painted in even brighter colours: Zion is not just a reconciled wife, she is like a virgin bride. This bridal image also occurs in 49,18 where Zion's sons have the role of bridal ornaments. This shows how fluid Isaiah is with roles of his characters in his images. This is also illustrated in 60,16 where, shortly after Zion has been portrayed as mother, she is portrayed as a suckling baby!

In 62,5 the image of sons returning to their mother and the image of Zion as bride are combined in the idea of the sons, representing the returning people, being the bridegroom of Zion. It is the people then who receive the crown in v. 3. In this light v. 11 can be seen as containing a veiled allusion to a wedding procession. This would be parallel to the description in Cant 3,6-11 of the wedding procession of King Solomon coming up from the desert with an escort. A somewhat conflicting description of a wedding procession is found in Ps 45,14-15 where the bride and her companions are led to the bridegroom's palace. Wright and Thompson⁽¹¹⁾ explain that the pattern seemed to be that first there was a procession of the bridegroom to the bride's house and that afterwards the bride was led back to the bridegroom's home. The procession might be accompanied by music and singing (Jer 7,34). This suggests that Isa 51,11 may also be an allusion to a wedding procession including the festal crown: "and come to Zion with singing; everlasting joy shall be upon their heads".

Zion's name in 62,12, *dērūšā*, "Sought out", also supports the idea of a wedding procession. It expresses a related idea to the name *hepšī-bah* in

(¹¹) J. S. WRIGHT-J. A. THOMPSON, "Marriage", *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (Sydney 1980) II, 956.

v. 4. While the reward and recompense in v. 11, which probably refers to the people (cf. 40,10-11), is most suggestive of a victorious conqueror returning with plunder, there may also be a hint of the idea of wedding gifts⁽¹²⁾. The fact that the procession consists of the Saviour, God, accompanied by the people, explains why the bridegroom in v. 5 can be seen in terms of both God and the sons. The return of the sons to Zion, which is seen as a marriage, is also the return of God to Zion. God's rejoicing over Zion is manifested concretely in the rejoicing of the returning exiles. God can be seen both as the bridegroom, who shows his love and joy to Zion, and as the officiator of the marriage, who causes the restoration to take place.

The underlying idea of Zion's marriage may also throw light on some of the other allusions in this passage. Isa 61,10 can be understood as the bride (Zion) or the bridegroom (the people) (or actually both subsumed into one) rejoicing over the wedding garments of salvation and righteousness which the Lord has provided. Thus the reference to righteousness and salvation shining out in 62,1 may also be alluding to the dazzling wedding garments. The nations and kings in v. 2 have the role of wedding guests. A part of the function of the watchmen posted on the walls in v. 6 may be to keep a lookout for the approach of the wedding procession.

Verses 8-9 seem to be a change of image but this is explicable if we recognize the dependence on Hosea 2. Both passages describe the restoration of Israel in terms of a new marriage between Yahweh and his bride. The strongest clue of dependence is the parallel of *dāgān* and *tîrôš* which occurs in Isa 62,8 and Hos 2,11. In Hosea they are the gifts of Yahweh to his wife, so they could have a similar connotation in Isa 62. The foreigners of Isa 62,8 correspond to the lovers of Hos 2,9.14. Both passages also speak of renaming.

By way of conclusion we may observe that the differences between the perspectives of these two passages are illuminating of how Isaiah uses the image of the marriage of Zion. In Hosea 2 the wife is blamed for misusing the food and wine that the Lord provided. In Isaiah 62, however, no blame is put on Zion; the Lord takes responsibility. In Hosea, the passage about wooing and betrothal of the wife is preceded by a condemnatory account of her sins. In Isaiah, Zion's sins are not itemized. In Isa 54 the rebuking of the wife is described but the reasons for the rebuke are passed over in silence. When sins are itemized, they are directed at the people, not Zion (e.g. ch. 57). Isaiah deliberately keeps the image of Zion quite positive, reserving it for the purpose of messages of comfort, restoration, delight and joy.

86 Pullenvale Rd.
Pullenvale, Queensland
Australia 4069

T. David ANDERSEN

⁽¹²⁾ For a discussion of the significance of wedding gifts in Israelite marriages see J. H. OTWELL, *And Sarah Laughed: The Status of Woman in the Old Testament* (Philadelphia 1977) 37-40.

Genesis 22: The Ideological Rhetoric and the Psychological Composition

"In the older days of Art,
Builders wrought with greatest care
Each minute and unseen part;
For the Gods see everywhere".

(Longfellow: *The Builders*)

The story of Isaac's binding seems to be one of the greatly drained biblical chapters in the history of biblical exegesis. The shuddering chronicle of the father, whose fathomless faith to his God almost led him to slay his only son, has been illuminated from varying standpoints, such as humanistic, theological, psychological, historical, literary and philosophical.

However, the critical tools bestowed by the literary approach⁽¹⁾ seem to provide the critic with insight to blaze an investigatory trail toward excavating new sites in this overly "ploughed" biblical domain.

The paper in focus will discuss the rhetorical and compositional layers of Isaac's binding story. In addition, it will demonstrate that literary devices gleaned in both trails of rhetoric and composition are not limited in a sense of *l'art pour l'art*, but are adroitly harnessed to the foundations of the story: ideology, theology and psychology.

The first rhetorical phenomenon is anchored in the chapter's ouverture, "And it came to pass after these things that God did tempt Abraham and said unto him... Take now thy son... and offer him... for a burnt offering..." (Gen 22,1-2). By utilizing the expression "did tempt" (*nisāh*), the narrator shares crucial information with the reader that was denied Abraham. If Abraham would have been acquainted with the concealed intention of the

(¹) The scholarly nature of the literary approach hereby suggested is largely inspired by the structuralist trail cultivated by Russian formalists such as Eichenbaum, Tynjanov and Tomashevskij. A useful survey of the Russian Formalism's literary scholarship is in the following studies: L. T. LEMON – M. J. REIS, eds. *Russian Formalist Criticism* (Lincoln, Nebraska 1965); V. ERLICH, *Russian Formalism* (Paris – The Hague 1969). The formalist criticism certainly propelled later scholarly trends of structuralism and post-structuralism. Among the leading critics and works of those structuralist tracks are the following: G. GENETTE, *Figures, essais* (Paris 1977); R. BARTHES, *Essais Critiques* (Paris 1964); ID., *S/Z* (Paris 1970); ID., *Le Plaisir du texte* (Paris 1973); T. TODOROV, *Grammaire du Décaméron*, (The Hague 1969); ID., *Théories du Symbole* (Paris 1977). A useful encounter with various trends of the post-structuralist criticism is found in J. V. HARARI (ed.), *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (Ithaca 1979).

divine command to slay his son, the trial would have been emptied of its value⁽²⁾.

Thus, an informative gap (which is ironic because any gap between two levels of awareness produces irony) between Abraham and the reader is cultivated by the narrator from the very beginning. The reader, in contrast to Abraham, is able to follow the forthcoming chronicle without fear since he expects a happy ending of the story. The plot's menacing features can no longer intimidate him.

In *prima vista*, the narrator's rhetorical policy of notifying the reader of the happy conclusion of the story at the earliest stage of reading, seems disturbingly questionable. The rhetorical policy appears to be executed by an implied author (following W. Booth's in his *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 1961) unaware of the rhetorical potential which exists in any fictional conclusion, especially one terminating a highly gripping story.

Instead of cultivating the story's thrilling features to mold a tensely animated reading process, the narrator seems remiss to disarm the story's most effective and promising rhetorical potential. But beyond this rhetorical stumbling, a cogent, ideological virtue emerges. While the thrilling plot of the binding story has literary merit, it also carries an ideological weakness. By capturing the reader's interest, the plot may divert attention from the ideological message behind it. Literary cover that is too attractive may eclipse the inner ideological lesson. Thus, once the reader is freed from the worry over the end of the story, he is capable of deciphering the ideological message — Abraham's exalted faith and devotion to God — that springs from them. Losing strong fictional interest enables the ideological lesson to become more obvious and consequently, more effective.

Hence, the seemingly remiss rhetoric is indeed a proficient literary tactic which adroitly harnesses the rhetorical layer to the ideological purpose.

The second rhetorical stratagem is interlaced in the divine command "... and get thee into the land of Moriah..." (v. 2; ... *welēk lēkā 'el 'ereṣ hāmoriah*...). This divine command echoes the one opening chapter 12, "Get thee out of thy country... unto a land that I will show thee" ("*lek lēkā me'arṣehā... 'el hā'āreṣ 'aṣer 'ār'ekā*"). The strict repetition of the most significant components in both divine commands (*lek, lekā, 'ereṣ/hā'āreṣ*) fortifies the analogy between the two commands and consequently, reinforces the allusion claim.

This allusion is a germ for both rhetorical and ideological virtues. Al-

⁽²⁾ This rhetorical phenomenon has already been noticed by biblical critics, such as Z. ADAR, *Genesis: An Approach to the Biblical World* (in Hebrew) (Tel Aviv 1967) 64; cf. also ID., *The Biblical Narrative* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem 1968) 31; and M. M. SARNA, *Understanding Genesis* (New York 1970) 161. Both critics compare this rhetorical phenomenon to an ideological demonstration of the Bible's recoil from a sacrifice of human beings. Gerhard von Rad detects an aesthetic-ideological function in this rhetorical phenomenon which resembles the one explored in this paper (G. VON RAD, *Genesis* [Philadelphia 1956] 234). Though critics have pointed out the rhetorical phenomenon hereby discussed, they did not attempt to portray its aesthetic mechanism, nor trace its ideological function.

though the analogy between the two commands is solid (based upon both verbal resemblance and thematic similarity, i.e., extrication from homeland), it still allows a considerable discrepancy.

The divine command in Gen 12, which ordains Abraham to leave his country for a new one, is absorbed with gladdening connotations as the new country is the promised one — the one in which the Lord will make Abraham “a great nation”. The divine command in Gen 22 which ordains Abraham to leave his country and go to the Moriah country is the reverse: the act which Abraham is compelled to commit in the new country is infiltrated with the murkiest connotations one can imagine. The connotational gulf between the two components of the allusion pattern produces a dense, ironic distance underlining the somber nature of Abraham’s mission in the Moriah land. The literary-ideological phenomenon demonstrated here is impressively intricate: it forms an allusion founded upon an analogy producing a contradictory analogy whose rhetorical impact is ironic and thus ideologically expressive.

One may also discern a rhetorical pattern of breached expectations. Once the reader identifies the analogy between the two components of the allusion pattern, he is spurred to assume that the first component in Gen 12 is probably auspicious and, consequently, portends the connotational character of the forthcoming component. As the reader reaches the second component (Gen 22) he finds out that the analogy has led him astray: his optimistic expectations are pierced and ironically frustrated.

Denied expectations produce “reverse” reading because the reader is compelled to return to previously-read information after future information casts a revealing light upon it. This pattern of frustrated expectations has an ideological function.

The disappointment that springs from the hopeful expectations’ refutation sharpens the reader’s awareness to the unexpected bleak nature which encompasses the story of Isaac’s binding and consequently, reinforces his awareness of Abraham’s firm faith. The aptitude of the biblical writer is therefore remaintained. He not only molds refined literary patterns, but also deftly mobilizes them to his ideological needs.

As alluded to, the second literary layer to be examined is composition. The predominant idea that the psychogenic world of the biblical character is dammed and bolted upon the reader’s ever unsatisfied inquisitiveness seems to interlace previous generations of critics.

Following this idea, the biblical means of characterization cannot be a limpid aperture to the heroes’ lives, but rather a perpetually opaque barrier. The Bible’s reader is deprived of acquaintance with the heroes’ psychological tissue and is doomed to ignorance about the *persona*’s inner reflections and doubts. This view of the art of biblical means of characterization was blatantly phrased by Erich Auerbach, in his *Mimesis*⁽³⁾. Yet, Auerbach’s idea

⁽³⁾ Cf. E. AUERBACH, *Mimesis* (Princeton, N.J. 1953): “thoughts and feelings remain unexpressed, are only suggested by the silence of fragmentary speeches...” (11).

about the impenetrable nature of biblical characters' psychogenic life neither prevailed nor petrified the biblical field of study. Critics have wisely pointed out that the psychological world of the biblical *persona* is not as obtuse as one may be tempted to assume⁽⁴⁾. Deeds executed by the biblical hero may proficiently reflect his thoughts and feelings. Once the critic acquaints himself with the behaviorist code of the biblical *persona*, he is able to crack the *persona*'s psychological riddle and decipher his psychogenic mechanism. The Bible's evident parsimony of utilizing direct means of psychological characterization is fully compensated for by enlisting indirect means of psychological characterization which enable the reader to invade the niches of the character's inner life.

An example of the Bible's indirect means of psychological characterization is inlaid in the compositional stratum of the biblical text and may be entitled the expressive order of presentation. As Abraham is notified by God of the grave mission which he is expected to carry out, he takes the following steps, "And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him, and Isaac his son, and clave the wood for the burnt offering, and rose up, and went unto the place of which God had told him" (v. 3).

Abraham's first act ("...rose up early in the morning") as well as the last ("...rose up and went...") are certainly both nonconvertible and irreplaceable; any alternative order should start with rising up in the morning and end with leaving. Only the following acts by Abraham are a legitimate matter for alternative orders of presentation, "...saddled his ass, took two of his young men, [took] Isaac..., clave the wood for the burnt offering...". This order of presenting Abraham's acts is undoubtedly one of many possible sequences. Thus, the biblical author may take the liberty of presenting Abraham's acts in any order for satisfying both artistic and ideological purposes.

In light of this, the predominant question which the critic encounters is, What goaded the biblical author to prefer this order over others? What did

⁽⁴⁾ Among works which display a useful awareness of the biblical hero's behavior as a reflecting metaphor which mirrors his inner psychological foundation are the following: A. BENTZEN, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Copenhagen 1957) I, 244: "We get no psychological pictures of the soul of the acting persons. The inner life of the men and women brought on the stage reveals itself in dialogues and acts"; VON RAD, *Genesis*, 235; Z. ADAR, *The Educational Values of the Bible* (in Hebrew) (Tel Aviv and Jerusalem 1953) 66; ID., *The Biblical Narrative* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem 1968) 31, 45. Adar also maintains that biblical silence is not less expressive than biblical dialogues (Cf. his *The Educational Values of the Bible*, 60). This useful observation is also alluded to by B. Vawter in his *On Genesis: A New Reading* (New York, 1977) 259. — Two penetrating studies of various biblical means of psychological characterization are the following: M. STERNBERG, "Between the Truth and All the Truth in the Biblical Narrative: Points of View and Molding of Psychological Life by Summarizing Penetration and Interior Monologue" (in Hebrew), *Hasifrut* VIII (1979) 110-146; M. STERNBERG, "Language, World and Perspective in the Biblical Art: The Indirect and Free Expressions and Ways of Implied Penetration" (in Hebrew), *Hasifrut* IX (1983) 88-131.

he expect to achieve, in terms of aesthetics and ideology, by giving up other possibilities of presentation and molding that particular one? The answer appears in the component which closes the chosen order, "and [Abraham] clave the wood for a burnt offering". This act is the one that reminds Abraham most of the atrocious mission which he is about to execute. Since Abraham suspends this emotionally-loaded act to the very end, he displays his natural intuitive recoil from his shocking obligation to his Lord and demonstrates the pestering psychological struggle within his bisected consciousness.

Abraham, the loving and chastised father, procrastinates as much as possible over the act which reminds him most of his forceful task as a believer. Hence, the order of presentation proves to be a deft, indirect means of psychological characterization, one which enables the reader to break through the seemingly impermeable psychogenic world of the biblical character revealing the concealed corners of his mind and heart.

"Everything remains unexpressed", Auerbach determines as he relates to the assumed biblical proclivity of treating feelings⁽⁵⁾. Not quite so; everything is indeed expressed, though differently.

The presentational order of Abraham's acts in v. 6 also has an expressive-psychological nature, "And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son; and he took the fire in his hand and a knife...". Like the previous occurrence of the psychological order of presentation, the presentational order displayed in this verse has many possibilities. Yet, Abraham's decision to take the knife is suspended to the very last moment. Obviously, taking the knife is the act which most foretells the coming flesh-creeping slaughter. The connotations of devouring and even preying which derive from the Hebrew word for knife, *ma'äkebet*, fortify the semantic gravity of the knife. Thus, the fact that Abraham stalls as much as possible before taking the knife is another cogent display of mobilizing composition for psychological characterization of the seemingly impervious emotional world of the biblical *persona*.

There are more instances in Isaac's binding story which exhibit the biblical text's inclination to enlist literary devices to portray the emotional and psychological intestine of the biblical *dramatis personae*.

The first bewildering phenomenon to be discussed is found in the opening of v. 6, "And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering and laid it upon Isaac his son...". Abraham's behavior, demonstrated by loading his innocent son with the very wood which will perish him, is disturbing indeed. The fact that the biblical narrator refers to Isaac not only by his name, but adds "his son", fortifies the emotional atmosphere permeating this verse, and consequently, sharpens the critical light that seems to morally eclipse Abraham.

One may look for a practical justification for Abraham's astounding behavior by believing that Abraham was rather old, while Isaac was in his

(5) Cf. AUERBACH, *Mimesis*, 11.

prime of life. But the validity of this explanation appears delusive since Abraham's physical capacity has been proven by his three-day march to Moriah land. This explanation fails also in light of the preceding verse (v. 5) which informs us of Abraham's decision to leave the ass behind with the two young men. If Abraham loaded Isaac with the wood for the burnt-offering for a mere practical reason, he could have certainly taken the ass and loaded it with the heavy wood. The fact that Abraham avoids this practical solution not only stresses his upsetting attitude toward his beloved son, but also sends the reader on an explanatory trail in a direction void of practical nature.

Abraham's seemingly cynical maltreatment toward his son is indeed a moving demonstration of his emotional distress, a touching fatherly attempt to withhold, as long as possible, from his beloved son his woeful fate. Abraham, the father, is still not ready for Abraham, the believer's mission. Once again, he arduously enlists any splinter of ruse to suspend the execution of his forthcoming odious mission. Obeying this psychological vein, "Venerable Father Abraham"⁽⁶⁾, loads his beloved son with the burnt-offering wood, pretending that nothing outstanding is about to happen. He acts as if they are headed toward a customary worship and the son is granted the honor of carrying the burnt-offering wood. Abraham's confusing attitude toward Isaac is therefore one more pitiful attempt to repress — even for a few moments more — the memory of the unavoidable upcoming atrocity and to defend his son from the startling truth.

Hence, the first impression of an ironically-cynical malignancy of Abraham, who loads his son with the wood which will stamp his thread of life, is a hoax. Beyond the delusive garment of an obstinate and hard-hearted father, beats a heart of a merciful and desperate father.

The first baffling impression has not gone astray in vain. Abraham's deceitful command to his two young men, "... abide ye here with the ass; and I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and come again to you" (v. 5) is no less perplexing than blatant⁽⁷⁾.

One may suggest the following plausible justifications for Abraham's evasion from the truth:

1) Abraham aimed to protect Isaac, evidently present as Abraham spoke to his young men, from the atrocious truth. Though he knew this protection was hopelessly flaccid, his fatherly instinct spurred him to procrastinate the presentation of the truth to his beloved son.

2) It was a similar humanistic concern and psychological instinct which conducted Abraham to save his young men for as long as possible from facing the atrocious truth⁽⁸⁾.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. S. KIERKEGAARD, *Frygt og Bæven (Fear and Trembling)*, (København 1983 [1843]).

⁽⁷⁾ Cf. ADAR, *The Biblical Narrative*, 34; VAWTER, *On Genesis: A New Reading*, 254.

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. VAWTER, *ibid.*; S. D. GOITEN, *Studies in Bible* (in Hebrew) (Tel Aviv 1967) 77.

There was another impulse which detained Abraham from speaking about the dreadful, upcoming truth. Perhaps he wished to believe that as long as he did not speak about the atrocity there remained a dim possibility of avoidance. One should be aware, in this context, of the psychological norms of the ancient world which attributed stupendous powers to words that seemed to bridge the gap between verbal expression and its materialization.

Thus, Abraham's evasion from verbally expressing the truth was a psychological wishful thinking: a verbal expression of the horrible truth is liable to foredoom its execution.

Although one may speculate on which of the three options motivated Abraham's decision toward evasion from the threatening truth, there is no reason to reject a possibility that all three played an equal part. Though the three potential justifications differ from each other, they all share one conspicuous common denominator: Abraham's great desire to psychologically repress the menacing knowledge of the nightmarish future. Abraham's protruding desire to delay the forthcoming atrocity earns more emphasis in light of his quickness to follow the instructions of the Lord ("... rose up early in the morning") when no time has been foreseen for the sacrifice, no date. However, one may be encouraged to adopt the conjecture that all three reasons for Abraham's natural recoil from uttering the impeccable truth are equally valid and simultaneously brought Abraham's evasive statement to his young helpers. It is not only a highly reasonable possibility, but also one which bestows an appealing tinge of alluring intricacy upon Abraham's psychological reaction.

In this respect, the rhetorical device which provokes the reader's wonder about Abraham's perplexing acts (loading Isaac with the burnt-offering wood; deviating from speaking the truth to his young men) possesses the same psychological function shared by the expressive presentational order; they both provide the reader with a loophole through which he may glance the biblical character's inner psychogenic mechanism, and they both deny the view which calls for an opaque and impenetrable psychological portrait of the biblical *persona*.

Another case of using tantalizing perplexion as a rhetorical means of psychological characterization is exhibited in the questionable role of the two young helpers Abraham calls before leaving for the sacrifice rally. It is naturally expected that those two young men are supposed to assist Abraham with the preparations for the trip. Abraham's considerable wealth and high social status strengthen the expectation that all needed toil will be carried out by his servants. In light of this, it is very surprising that Abraham does not let these two young servants commit to their task and prefers to do it by himself: he is the one who saddles the ass and cleaves the wood for the burnt-offering. This questionable behavior by the master, who carries out his servants' duties, may also be considered a psychological means of characterization. By taking over his servants' duties, Abraham aims to occupy himself with matters which presumably help him divert his thoughts from his upcoming shuddering mission. Furthermore, perhaps by committing himself to his servants' duties, Abraham temporarily postpones the execution of his horrible task. This suspension is one more view into Abraham's psychological

inwards. Hence, Abraham's confusing behavior is nothing more than a rhetorical signpost calling the reader's attention to the character's psychological characterization. Once again, the biblical writer pulls up the curtain from the character's impermeable inner life and the reader is granted access to the psychological mechanism of the character.

Hence, binding Isaac's chronicle to the altar of literary criticism appears considerably rewarding: it not only brings to light the inner, artistic filaments of the biblical text, but also its psychological motivations and underlying human currents.

Dept. of Hebrew & Semitic Studies
University of Wisconsin - Madison
Madison, WI 53706

Yair MAZOR

«Lazare est mort» (note sur Jean 11,14-15)

Lors de la fête de la Dédicace, à son quatrième séjour à Jérusalem — le quatrième dans l'Évangile de Jean — en hiver — l'hiver qui précéda sa mort — Jésus dit aux Juifs: «Moi et mon Père sommes un». Blasphème intolérable. On prend des pierres pour lapider le criminel, lequel s'affirme encore Fils de Dieu; et les Juifs cherchent à se saisir de lui (10,30-39).

L'heure, cependant, n'est pas encore venue. Jésus s'en va, loin de Jérusalem. Il gagne, outre Jourdain, l'endroit où Jean baptisait (1,28; 3,26), c'est-à-dire Béthanie en Pérée. Saint Jean dit qu' «il alla séjourner là», ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ (10,40). Rien ne dit la durée du séjour, mais Jésus, après tant d'actes, de signes, de débats et de discours, après une telle activité déployée à Jérusalem, devait éprouver le besoin de respirer l'air pur de la campagne, loin de l'atmosphère malsaine du Temple. Il dut rester là un certain temps; c'est là aussi que beaucoup «se mirent à croire en lui», πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ (10,42). Là-dessus s'achève le chapitre 10.

Au début du chapitre 11, quelques semaines sans doute avant Pâques, Jean écrit que quelqu'un «se trouvait être malade»⁽¹⁾. La maladie ne datait donc pas d'hier. Le malade était Lazare, de Béthanie⁽²⁾, le village de Marthe et de Marie, ses sœurs. Comme souvent, Jean place une note explicative dans une parenthèse (11,18): cette Béthanie-là est située à quinze stades de Jérusalem, c'est-à-dire à moins de trois kilomètres et à l'est de la grande ville.

Inquiètes pour la santé de leur frère, Marthe et Marie se tournent vers Jésus, dont elles connaissent l'affection. Jean ne parle pas d'un messager, mais un tel homme est impliqué par le texte, puisqu'un message est délivré à Jésus⁽³⁾: κύριε, ἴδε ὃν φιλεῖς ἀσθενεῖ (v. 3), «Seigneur, voyez, celui pour qui vous avez de la tendresse est malade».

Visiblement soucieuses de laisser Jésus à l'abri, loin d'une contrée et d'une ville dangereuses pour sa vie, et de lui épargner la cinquantaine de kilomètres d'une route difficile et montante qui sépare les deux Béthanie, elles se sont décidées tardivement non pas à faire appel à Jésus, mais simplement à l'informer de la maladie d'un ami.

(1) Le participe périphrastique ἦν ἀσθενῶν a plus de force qu'un simple imparfait.

(2) Lazare et ses sœurs appartiennent visiblement à une famille aisée, connue. Ils ont beaucoup d'amis, pour qui la maison est ouverte: 11,3.5.11.19.31-36. En 12,3-5 Marie oint les pieds de Jésus avec un parfum de nard très pur valant bien trois-cents deniers.

(3) Ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγουσαι, expression très grecque: ce ne sont pas elles qui parlent, mais celui qui est chargé d'annoncer la mauvaise nouvelle.

Le messager a dû se hâter, faire la route à cheval, sans doute, mais il n'a pu arriver à destination avant la fin du premier jour de l'épisode, au plus tôt. Jésus lui répond: Αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς θάνατον... «cette maladie-là n'est pas une maladie qui conduit à la mort»⁽⁴⁾.

Rien n'est dit du retour du messager, personnage effacé. On peut croire qu'il n'a pas traîné pour rapporter aux sœurs la réponse rassurante; mais cette fois il doit faire la route en sens inverse; elle monte du Jourdain jusqu'à Jérusalem, exigeant plus de temps qu'à l'aller. Il est revenu au plus tôt le soir du deuxième jour.

La scène ne s'est pas déplacée avec lui. Le récit a continué à Béthanie d'outre-Jourdain. Jésus n'a pas l'air de s'inquiéter de la maladie de son ami. Il reste deux jours au même endroit (v. 6), les second et troisième jours de l'histoire, et les disciples sont loin de s'en alarmer, puisqu'ils ont compris, en écoutant Jésus et en le voyant s'attarder, que Lazare n'était pas en danger de mort. Leur inquiétude est vive, au contraire, lorsque, «ensuite, après cela» (v. 7), c'est-à-dire le quatrième jour de l'histoire, Jésus leur dit brusquement: «Eh! bien, retournons en Judée». Angoisse légitime puisque Jésus risque d'être lapidé à Jérusalem, lui et ses disciples aussi. Mais le Maître répond simplement qu'une route se fait de jour, et non de nuit (vv. 9-10). Il annonce son départ, et la route va se faire évidemment pendant cette journée, la quatrième de l'épisode⁽⁵⁾.

Il a soin de rassurer aussitôt les disciples sur le malade en ajoutant: Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν κεκοίμηται, ἀλλὰ πορεύομαι ἵνα ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν (v. 11), «Lazare notre ami repose, mais je *vais aller* le réveiller». Le parfait du verbe κοιμᾶν fait si bien tomber leur appréhension sur le malade qu'ils le reprennent aussitôt à leur compte: «S'il repose (εἰ κεκοίμηται), il sera sauvé».

Mais ils n'ont pas compris ce que Jésus voulait dire en parlant de repos et de salut. Jean ouvre alors une nouvelle parenthèse au verset 13 pour empêcher son lecteur de partager leur erreur: Jésus avait parlé de la mort de Lazare, mais les disciples ont compris qu'il s'agissait d'un tout autre repos, celui du sommeil⁽⁶⁾.

Jésus cependant s'exprime aussitôt en toute clarté et dissipe l'erreur par

(4) Après le verbe εἰμι, la préposition πρὸς a une valeur prégnante. On trouve l'expression trois fois chez Jean, ici et aux deux premiers versets du prologue; elle a un sens fort puisque le verbe marque un état, sans mouvement, et la préposition une direction, avec mouvement. Un emploi analogue se trouve ailleurs que chez Jean, mais avec un sens moins fort, et le verbe εἰμι est généralement remplacé par un verbe de valeur voisine (μένειν, γίγνεσθαι, παρῆναι) chez Paul, 1 Th 3,4; 2 Th 2,5; 3,10; 1 Co 16,10; 2 Co 11,9; 12,21; Ga 1,18 et 20, et aussi chez Luc 22,56, toujours dans la signification voisine de «face à», «en face de».

(5) Les versets annoncent en quelque sorte la marche dans la lumière et dans l'obscurité de 12,35.

(6) La notion de repos, dans le sommeil ou bien dans la mort, est soulignée par l'emploi du parfait κεκοίμηται, qui signifie un *état*, soit durable, soit définitif.

ce coup de foudre d'une révélation inattendue, Λάζαρος ἀπέθανεν⁽⁷⁾, «Lazare est mort» (v. 14).

Avant d'en venir au verset 15, notre sujet, il importe d'examiner la succession des faits et des jours qui le suivent, à partir du départ de Jésus et des disciples, quand ils quittent Béthanie d'outre-Jourdain pour gagner Béthanie de Judée.

Ils ont accompli le trajet la quatrième journée, et la marche en groupe leur a certainement fait perdre du temps. Il n'est pas concevable qu'ils aient atteint leur destination en moins d'une journée de marche et, lorsque Jean peut écrire que Jésus est arrivé (ἔλθων, au v. 17), on est au cinquième jour au moins de l'épisode.

Ici le témoin que fut l'évangéliste donne une précision précieuse, relative à la chronologie. A son arrivée, Jésus trouve que Lazare est déjà *depuis quatre jours*⁽⁸⁾ dans le tombeau; la date est confirmée par le v. 39, lorsque Marthe hésite à faire soulever la pierre tombale: «Cela⁽⁹⁾ sent déjà, car il est à son quatrième jour».

Cette indication, donnée par l'évangéliste, confirme ce que l'on pouvait tirer du seul texte. Elle montre clairement que Lazare a succombé à sa maladie le premier jour de l'épisode, c'est-à-dire pendant le voyage d'aller du messager, au plus tard à la fin du voyage. Lazare est sinon *déjà mort*, du moins à l'article de la mort — et Jésus ne peut pas l'ignorer — au moment où le messager arrive et lui «apprend» que son ami est malade, au moment où les disciples entendent dire à Jésus que cette maladie n'est pas mortelle.

Les délais ici donnés reposent sur un calcul des jours serré à l'extrême, et supposent que Lazare a été inhumé le lendemain même de sa mort, selon l'usage: dans les familles juives importantes on hâte l'embaumement. Si les déplacements du messager, puis de Jésus, ont exigé plus d'une journée, la mise au tombeau s'est faite un jour plus tard, deux peut-être, mais il reste — et c'est là l'important — que Lazare était mort, ou sur le point de mourir, lorsque Jésus reçut la nouvelle de sa maladie; et l'on devine quelles furent les pensées de Marthe et de Marie lorsque le messager leur rapporta la réponse rassurante de Jésus *après* la mort de leur frère. Jean a choisi de ne pas les dire.

Il est possible à présent de remonter à notre verset 15, qui suit immédiatement la brusque révélation faite aux disciples que «Lazare est mort». Le texte original, n'offrant pas de variante, est sûr. Donnons-le sans sa ponctua-

(7) Il importe de se rendre compte que cet aoriste fait un contraste violent avec le parfait du verbe précédent; on le verra plus loin. Ce contraste ne peut être sensible dans une traduction.

(8) Le fait que le «jour» commence au coucher du soleil chez les Juifs ne change rien au calcul des jours, dont le premier et le dernier peuvent ne pas être entiers.

(9) Sans que le sens en soit affecté, ὄζει doit être employé dans la tournure impersonnelle, selon l'usage de la langue grecque pour dire «il tonne», «il pleut», «il neige», etc. Le pronom «il» désignait primitivement le dieu qui «tonnait» etc. avant qu'il ne s'efface dans des cas semblables pour laisser le verbe devenir tout à fait impersonnel, la notion du dieu étant oubliée.

tion, comme il est dans les premiers manuscrits: καὶ χαίρω δι' ὑμᾶς ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅτι οὐκ ἦμην ἐκεῖ, un début de verset qu'il serait prématuré de traduire. Il se termine par les quatre mots de la décision du Maître: ἀλλ' ἄγωμεν πρὸς αὐτόν, qui ne prêtent pas à discussion, «eh! bien, allons auprès de lui».

La Vulgate, après «Lazarus mortuus est», qui achève le verset 13, écrit «et gaudeo propter vos ut credatis, quoniam non eram ibi; sed eamus ad eum». Les traductions françaises ordinaires, renversant l'ordre des deux propositions de la fin, sont du type «Lazare est mort, et je me réjouis pour vous de n'avoir pas été là, pour que vous croyiez». Sont-elles satisfaisantes?

Un parfait connaisseur du grec moderne, du grec ancien aussi, a donné il y a un demi-siècle une étude importante, trop peu connue, dont les dernières pages sont consacrées à notre verset 15⁽¹⁰⁾. Il note l'embarras des traducteurs et des commentateurs devant la proposition ὅτι οὐκ ἦμην ἐκεῖ: faut-il traduire «parce que je n'étais pas là» et rattacher cette proposition à πιστεύσητε (croyiez) ou à χαίρω (je me réjouis)? Il donne deux catégories d'exemples de cette hésitation:

A/ «Je me réjouis de ce que je n'étais pas là», et O. Merlier cite le P. Calmas (1904), Loisy (1921), Delafosse (1925), le P. Lagrange (1927)⁽¹¹⁾;

B/ «afin que vous croyiez parce que je n'étais pas là», et l'auteur passe à l'interprétation douteuse» d'Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (1905), déjà apparente chez les commentateurs anciens, comme Nonnos, *Paraphrase*, 11,50, et même saint Jean Chrysostome, *In Johannem homil.* (éd. de Montfaucon, 1836), avant de faire la légitime question:

«Comment admettre... que Jésus se réjouisse de n'avoir pas été présent à la mort de Lazare, alors qu'à la nouvelle de sa maladie il s'attarde deux jours avant de partir pour Béthanie (v. 6), de laquelle il s'est éloigné d'une journée de marche et où il arrivera quatre jours après la mort de Lazare (v. 17). Que ce retard ait été volontaire, soit, mais qu'il devienne pour Jésus une raison de se réjouir, voici qui est étrange». Et il ajoute: «Est-ce enfin par suite de son absence que les disciples auraient foi en leur maître?... Croiront-ils en lui parce qu'il a, par son absence, laissé mourir son ami?»

On ne suivra pas toutes les conclusions de Merlier bien qu'elles nous mettent en partie, croyons-nous, sur la voie du sens vrai. Commençons par nous reporter à une note de H. Pernot, sur le verset, tirée de son édition des quatre Evangiles⁽¹²⁾.

Dans cette note, p. 368, l'auteur écrit: «*Afin que vous croyiez, ou parce que vous croirez.* Mots éliminés par Blass pour plusieurs raisons, toutes valables. Reste le *pour vous*, qui exprime la même idée que *pour que vous*

⁽¹⁰⁾ O. MERLIER, «Note sur deux passages du quatrième Évangile», *BCH* 54 (1930) 228-240. Les deux passages sont «Jean 11,11 et le sens de κοιμᾶσθαι», p. 228-235, et «Jean 11,14», p. 235-240.

⁽¹¹⁾ Une traduction de ce genre donne l'impression que l'absence de Jésus aux côtés de son ami malade est due au hasard plus qu'à sa volonté.

⁽¹²⁾ H. PERNOT, *Les quatre Évangiles*, nouvellement traduits et annotés 2ème édition, revue par O. Merlier (Paris 1962).

croyez: Jésus serait heureux de la mort de Lazare parce qu'elle va être l'occasion d'un miracle probant pour les disciples. Avaient-ils besoin de celui-là, après ceux qui précèdent? Les passages qui se présentent de cette façon sont toujours suspects. Addition liturgique s'adressant aux assistants? Sans répondre à sa propre question, Pernot affirme qu'il faut lire «Lazare est mort parce que je n'étais pas là». Il renvoie à l'article de Merlier et ajoute «Jésus, en effet, préserve de la Mort (v. 25)».

De ces discussions sera retenu seul le point qui paraît essentiel, c'est-à-dire l'idée que si Lazare est mort, c'est parce que — comme le diront Marthe et Marie — Jésus n'était pas là. Mais il est nécessaire de dépasser cette idée pour la mettre dans son contexte, la clarifier et, s'il se peut, saisir le sens de l'ensemble du verset 15.

Trois remarques préliminaires s'imposent. Elles sont relatives à la valeur de chacun des deux verbes principaux de la phrase, ἀπέθανεν, «il est mort», et χαίρω, «je me réjouis», ainsi qu'à la conjonction καί, «et», qui les relie l'un à l'autre. Le rapprochement de la mort et de la joie a de quoi surprendre: Jésus peut-il se réjouir d'une mort qui a déjà plongé Marthe et Marie dans la douleur?

Commençons par le second des deux verbes. Χαίρω doit avoir un sens fort, «je suis dans la joie», parce que c'est la joie éprouvée par Jésus, et qui l'exprime. Le verbe donne tout de suite l'impression d'être pris dans son emploi absolu. Sa première personne de l'indicatif présent ne se rencontre jamais ailleurs dans les quatre évangiles, et le verbe n'est jamais accompagné ailleurs de la préposition διὰ signifiant la cause. «Je suis dans la joie, à cause de vous». Ce sont les disciples, ou la pensée des disciples, qui causent la joie de Jésus, et seul Jésus peut dire qu'il ressent cette joie⁽¹³⁾.

Ce verbe χαίρω est lié au précédent, du moins il semble que ce soit une liaison, par καί, «et», on le sait. Ce mot, discret entre tous, ne doit pas passer inaperçu, car il est riche de sens, en tombant plus sur le verbe qui suit que sur celui qui précède. Nous avons là le καί qui signifie καίτοι, ou καὶ ὁμως, «et pourtant», une particule éclairée par une idée concessive, chargée de souligner une anomalie: *bien que* telle chose se passe, *pourtant* c'est le contraire qu'elle entraîne; telle chose a lieu, *et pourtant* c'est le contraire qui se produit⁽¹⁴⁾; «Lazare est mort, *et pourtant* je suis dans la joie». Dans une traduction, comme dans le langage parlé, il n'est pas nécessaire d'exprimer le «pourtant» si l'on sent, ou si l'on fait sentir, la nuance de ce «et», qui indique l'étonnement.

⁽¹³⁾ Chez Paul il est naturel que l'on trouve un tel χαίρω, lorsqu'il parle de sa propre joie: un seul exemple absolu (Ph 2,17); deux exemples avec ἐπὶ (Rm 16,19; 1 Co 16,17); deux exemples avec ἐν (Col 1,24; Ph 1,18); deux exemples avec ὅτι (2 Co 7,9 et 7,16).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Jean fait un assez large emploi de ce καί notamment pour souligner le refus d'un témoignage, un refus dont Jésus souligne lui-même l'anomalie: 3,11; 3,32; 5,40; emploi voisin dans le prologue, 1,5; 1,10; et aussi 6,70; 7,28. Exemples encore dans Mt 6,26; 10,29; 1 Co 5,2; 2 Co 6,9. Il n'est pas indispensable de traduire ce καί par «et pourtant», à condition que le ton fasse sentir l'anomalie.

Le καί offre une seconde particularité, plus importante: c'est le καί que l'on trouve quelquefois employé, dans le grec classique et dans le Nouveau Testament, pour introduire une parenthèse, généralement courte, une idée ou, comme ici, un sentiment incident, qui vient s'annexer un moment à la proposition précédente; pour rendre sensible sa présence, on met les mots entre deux tirets. Ainsi, en 2,9, le majordome a goûté l'eau, devenue vin — et il ne savait d'où il venait — puis, la parenthèse refermée, la phrase continue⁽¹⁵⁾.

Ce n'est pas tout. Puisque parenthèse il y a, il importe de délimiter son étendue, ou, en d'autres termes, de chercher où placer le second tiret. La parenthèse, a-t-on dit, est d'ordinaire courte. Elle se referme aussitôt que l'idée annexe y incluse se suffit à elle-même. Or, ici, elle se suffit à elle-même, comme on vient de le voir en examinant ce qui, dans un mouvement naturel, accompagne le verbe χαίρω, c'est-à-dire δι' ὑμᾶς, «à cause de vous». Il est donc immédiatement probable, sous réserve d'une confirmation postérieure, qu'elle inclut les seuls quatre mots καὶ χαίρω δι' ὑμᾶς, «et je suis dans la joie à cause de vous». Quand il y aura lieu de ponctuer la phrase, une virgule étant devenue inutile après ἀπέθανεν, il faudra sans doute placer le premier tiret avant καί, le second après ὑμᾶς. Cette parenthèse reconnue, les conséquences seront fort importantes: elles permettront de révéler ce que Jésus a voulu dire.

La troisième remarque préliminaire nous ramène au premier verbe principal, celui qui précède la parenthèse, ἀπέθανεν. Ce verbe mérite un examen non moins attentif. Sans doute est-il uni par καί au verbe χαίρω qui le suit, mais il en est séparé par un tiret. Le sujet n'est pas le même. Le temps n'est pas le même. Les deux verbes ne sont pas sur le même plan.

On rencontre le verbe ἀπέθανεν en général sous cette forme, à l'aoriste, et sa fréquence, comme son sens, porte à oublier que c'est un *aoriste*. Sans doute le verbe n'est-il jamais employé au parfait ἀποτέθηκα dans le Nouveau Testament⁽¹⁶⁾; mais il est impossible qu'un verbe signifiant «mourir» soit privé en grec d'un parfait. Quand l'auteur a besoin d'exprimer l'idée d'un *état* de mort, il emploie, à l'indicatif, τέθηκα, sans préverbe, et, selon les exigences de la phrase, τεθνηκώς au participe, τεθνηκέναι à l'infinitif. Le Nouveau Testament offre en tout neuf exemples de ce parfait, Mt, 2,20; Mc 15,44; Lc 7,12; 8,49; Ac 14,19; 25,19; 1 Tm 5,6 et, chez Jean, outre le présent exemple, 11,44 et 19,33.

Deux de ces exemples sont à mettre en vedette pour la raison qu'ils font voir une opposition, significative, entre le parfait et l'aoriste rapprochés l'un de l'autre dans la même phrase, ou en deux phrases voisines:

— Mc 15,44: ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθηκεν, καὶ... ἐπερώτησεν εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν, «Pilate s'étonna *qu'il fût déjà mort* (parfait τέθηκεν) et demanda (au centurion) *s'il était mort depuis longtemps* (aoriste ἀπέθανεν)».

⁽¹⁵⁾ Même emploi Rm 1,13. Voir le dictionnaire BAUER-GINGRICH, s.v. I i.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cette forme est exceptionnelle dans la langue grecque. La forme usuelle du parfait est prise au verbe θνήσκειν.

- Lc 8,49:... ἐρχεται τις... λέγων ὅτι τέθνηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου, «... arrive quelqu'un... disant : ta fille *est morte* (parfait τέθνηκεν)»; puis, au verset 52, Jésus rectifie: οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει, «*elle n'est pas morte* (aoriste ἀπέθανεν, comme on l'avait cru trop vite, un instant plus tôt), mais elle dort».

La différence entre l'aoriste et le parfait n'apparaît pas dans une traduction française. Dans les deux cas elle ne peut être que «il est mort»⁽¹⁷⁾, mais un abîme sépare les deux temps du grec. Avec le parfait, l'idée de *il est mort* est celle d'un *état*, actuel, définitif, moins parce qu'il s'agit de la mort que parce que le temps est un parfait. Si je dis «aujourd'hui il est mort» les mots signifient qu'il est *déjà* mort au moment où je parle, que *maintenant* il est mort. Avec l'aoriste, l'idée de *il est mort* est liée à une *circonstance*, à un *moment* du passé, le moment comme la circonstance pouvant être exprimé par un adverbe de temps ou par une proposition circonstancielle. Si je dis «il est mort aujourd'hui», c'est que la mort *a eu lieu* avant le moment où je me place pour parler de sa mort. Le temps sera l'aoriste. La mort est un état définitif, sans doute, mais par nature, nullement parce qu'elle est exprimée par cet aoriste. Lorsque Jésus emploie un aoriste, il ne dit pas que Lazare *soit mort pour toujours*.

Or, et c'est là le point, dans toutes les traductions ordinaires envisagées ci-dessus — sauf dans celle de Merlier mais on ne peut la suivre jusqu'au bout — l'aoriste ἀπέθανεν est compris comme si Jean avait écrit τέθνηκεν, un parfait. Jésus avait pu dire aux disciples, un instant plus tôt, que Lazare κεκοίμηται, «il est dans l'*état* de sommeil» — un sommeil dont il allait le tirer. Ici au contraire il ne leur annonce nullement l'*état* de la mort, il leur dit les *circonstances* qui ont entouré la mort. L'aoriste ἀπέθανεν, «il est mort», est étroitement lié à la première subordonnée, une finale, introduite par ἵνα: il est mort *pour que vous croyiez*.

Il est en effet difficile de penser que cette finale⁽¹⁸⁾ dépende de l'autre principale, χαίρω, «je suis dans la joie», d'abord parce que celle-ci est mise dans une parenthèse, ensuite pour une raison de sens. Est-on dans la joie en vue d'une chose dont la réalisation n'est ni immédiate ni, comme on peut le voir dans le cas de Judas (6,70-72; 12,4-6; voir aussi 2,23-25), certaine pour tous?

D'autre part, il faut une raison à la mort de Lazare, et pas seulement une fin. Cette raison est la même que celle de la résurrection; et le verset 42 qui,

⁽¹⁷⁾ Le passé simple «il mourut» n'est pas rare, mais il est inconcevable dans les exemples relevés.

⁽¹⁸⁾ En principe l'idée d'un ἵνα complétif n'est pas impossible après un verbe comme χαίρω. Ce verbe de sentiment se construit d'ordinaire avec un participe complétif, quelquefois avec ὅτι, «que», ou «parce que». Mais une fois le verbe de sens voisin ἀγαλλιάω, «être dans l'allégresse», est suivi chez Jean d'un ἵνα complétif, 8,56. C'est un cas exceptionnel. Toujours chez Jean, lorsqu'ἵνα est, comme ici, suivi du verbe πιστεύειν appliqué à la foi, il est final: 1,7; 6,30; 9,36; 11,42; 13,19; 14,29; 19,35; 20,31. En 17,21 πιστεύω peut avoir un sens faible. Il est difficile de croire que la seule exception soit celle de notre verset 15.

avec notre verset 15, donne le sens de tout l'épisode, ne laisse aucun doute: il faut que le peuple vienne à croire que Jésus est bien le Messie. La proposition «pour que vous croyiez» dépend donc bien, elle aussi, de la première principale «il est mort». «Il est mort... pour que vous croyiez».

Quant à la seconde proposition subordonnée circonstancielle, la causale, «parce que je n'étais pas là», elle ne peut être subordonnée à la seconde principale χαίρω, «je suis dans la joie», puisqu'elle en est séparée par la finale, dépendant de ἀπέθανεν, qui la précède. Elle pourrait à la rigueur — grammaticalement la chose est possible — dépendre de la première subordonnée, «pour que vous croyiez, parce que je n'étais pas là», mais ici encore le contexte donne la solution.

Se peut-il que Jésus veuille dire aux disciples que c'est son éloignement du malade qui doit déterminer leur foi? Ce serait contraire à toute vraisemblance. Il faut que la foi soit une conséquence de la mort de Lazare. Non seulement le sens est ainsi naturel, mais l'équilibre de la phrase, les qualités littéraires de Jean, la cohérence de la pensée de Jésus exigent que la causale dépende, au même titre que la finale, du verbe «il est mort», l'aoriste ἀπέθανεν, qui veut une double suite et qui, dans l'histoire d'une résurrection, joue le rôle premier.

On objectera peut-être que les deux subordonnées, la finale et la causale, ne sont pas liées par une particule de coordination. Oui, en principe elles devraient l'être. Mais ici l'asyndète à la fois renforce l'importance du verbe «il est mort» et le met en relief; elle trahit l'émotion de Jésus, déjà bouleversé d'avoir voulu la mort de Lazare, devant les disciples, et qui va dans un instant verser des larmes, devant Marthe et Marie (vv. 33 et 35).

Apparaît maintenant dans tout son jour la pensée de Jésus lorsqu'il annonce aux disciples que Lazare ne dort pas mais qu'il est mort. Il laisse voir que ni la maladie ni le hasard n'ont été plus forts que lui; c'est lui qui a dirigé tout, voulu tout. Il avait dit aux disciples qu'il allait «réveiller» son ami (v. 11). Il va le réveiller en effet dans peu de temps. Mais ce réveil exige la mort de Lazare, et Lazare, ne peut mourir que si Jésus, par son éloignement, le laisse mourir; et si Jésus le laisse mourir, c'est pour développer la foi des disciples ou la faire naître en eux⁽¹⁹⁾.

Si l'on voulait découvrir et développer tout ce que contient notre verset, dans sa logique interne, il faudrait en aligner toutes les idées, exprimées ou suggérées, des idées entrecoupées des silences suscités par le conflit entre la douleur et la joie. Ainsi: Lazare est mort (un silence; et pas de ponctuation) — et pourtant je suis dans la joie; et si je suis dans la joie, c'est à cause de vous⁽²⁰⁾ — (un silence, puis retour à la mort de Lazare, après la parenthèse) et s'il est mort c'est *pour que* vous soyez touchés par la foi; (un silence) et s'il est mort, c'est *parce que* je n'étais pas là: j'ai attendu deux jours avant de

⁽¹⁹⁾ La foi a des degrés comme elle a des étapes. Jean lui-même n'aura la plénitude de la foi que dans le tombeau, quand il constate qu'il est vide (20,8).

⁽²⁰⁾ Ce *vous* est appuyé. Il désigne les disciples présents, avant le peuple qui, dans son ensemble, va demeurer irréductible.

partir pour aller à lui; je l'ai laissé mourir... pour avoir à le ressusciter. Voilà ce que j'ai voulu. A vous de le comprendre.

A nous de comprendre que l'aoriste de la mort de Lazare n'est pas un parfait; il appelle ses conséquences; la mort de Lazare ne s'arrête pas là. Notre verset donne une *parole* de Jésus, avec ses silences qu'il faut entendre, une parole environnée d'un mystère qui va s'éclaircir; elle *est* déjà l'*acte*, annoncé comme expliqué, que l'on va voir accompli, la résurrection de l'ami. Et cet acte, il n'était pas question de l'accomplir de loin, et de guérir Lazare comme il avait guéri le fils de l'officier royal (4,49-50), sans le voir. Il fallait, pour qu'il eût la plénitude de son sens, que la scène où le mort se relève d'un seul bloc, comme une statue, pieds et mains liés et le visage entouré d'un suaire, tout vivant et les yeux pleins de ce qu'il avait vu dans l'au-delà, il fallait que cette scène dramatique eût des témoins nombreux, les uns pour une foi naissante ou à naître, les autres pour être ancrés dans leur détermination de conduire Jésus à la Croix.

Cette scène, Jean l'a placée au centre de son Évangile, au moment où Jésus sait qu'il va mourir. Jusque là son heure n'était pas encore venue (2,24; 7,30; 8,20). Maintenant la résurrection de Lazare signifie que l'heure est venue, et Jésus est le premier à le savoir⁽²¹⁾. Lazare doit sortir du tombeau pour que Jésus entre dans le sien.

Notre verset 15 annonce le prologue de la Passion; la mort et la résurrection de Lazare préfigurent la mort et la résurrection de Jésus. Les disciples, en fin de compte, avaient eu raison de comprendre que si Lazare reposait, il serait sauvé (v. 12). Marthe et Marie avaient eu raison de dire l'une et l'autre à Jésus, sans lui faire aucun reproche mais en affirmant leur foi en lui, que s'il avait été là (11,21 et 33)⁽²²⁾ leur frère ne serait pas mort puisque, lorsque Jésus est là, il nous fait assister à la résurrection du mort; il est bien la résurrection et la vie (v. 25) et son absence est la mort.

Tout se tient; et tout est dit dans le verset 15, dont la richesse et la concision défient une traduction qui possède les mêmes vertus. En désespoir de cause on proposera la version qui semble la moins infidèle; mais elle a le défaut de répéter deux fois le mot «mort», sous peine de laisser croire que c'est l'absence de Jésus qui a causé la foi des disciples:

«Lazare est mort — et je suis dans la joie, à cause de vous — mort pour que vous veniez à la foi, mort parce que je n'étais pas là».

La Giride
F-84210 La Roque-sur-Pernes

Édouard DELEBECQUE

⁽²¹⁾ Voir 11,50 (paroles de Caïphe); 12,10.23.27; 13,1.

⁽²²⁾ L'adverbe ἐκεῖ, «là-bas», dit par Jésus, au verset 15, de l'endroit où il n'est pas, se confond avec l'adverbe ὧδε, «ici», dit par Marthe au v. 21, puis par Marie au v. 32, de l'endroit où elles sont, Béthanie de Judée.

La variante neotestamentaria «levadura de los panes»

En las palabras de Jesús sobre el esmero en guardarse de la levadura de los fariseos y saduceos, hubo una mala interpretación de parte de sus discípulos. Estos pensaron que Jesús se refería al hecho de que ellos se hubiesen olvidado de tomar panes. Entonces Jesús concreta de qué clase de fermento se trata: no del de los panes, sino del de la doctrina de los fariseos y saduceos. Con esta aclaración, los discípulos (Mt 16,12) τότε συνήκαν ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν προσέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν ἄρτων, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς διδαχῆς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

En este versículo hay una variante digna de consideración, cuya discusión ha sido ya tratada⁽¹⁾. Es la lectura ἀπο τῆς ζύμης τῶν ἄρτων, y particularmente τῶν ἄρτων. Esta variante, con el correspondiente versículo, no puede obviamente estudiarse sin atención al contexto mateano. En efecto, en el v. 6 recordamos que se lee: ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων; y en el v. 11 encontramos estas expresiones: οὐ περὶ ἄρτων... ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

Esto supuesto, y a la vista de las variantes del v. 12, que en seguida exponremos, parece muy acertado lo que Metzger (l.c.) dice: «In view of the use of the expression 'the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees' in verses 6 and 11, it was perhaps natural that a few witnesses should repeat one or both of the words 'Pharisees' 'Sadducees' after ζύμης in ver. 12». Proponemos, pues, las variantes que en este versículo se refieren a nuestro tema:

ἀπο τῆς ζύμης τῶν ἄρτων

κ^c B L 892 1009 1241 148 1184 1211 *aur g' l vg sa bo^{ms} eth?*

ἀπο τῆς ζύμης τοῦ ἄρτου

CEFGHKMOSUVWXYΓΔΠΣΦΩ 28 700 1010 1071 1079

1195 1230 1242 1253 1344 1365 1646 2148 2174 *cf q sy^{ph} sa^{ms} bo^{ms} eth? geo^A Diat*

ἀπο τῶν ἄρτων

11 517 1675 *e [k]*

ἀπο τῆς ζύμης

D Θ 113 565 *a b d ff² sy^s arm geo^{1B} Lcf*

ἀπο τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων

κ^{*} 349 1185st *ff¹ sy^c Diat^v*

ἀπο τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων

33

(1) Cf. B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London-New York 1975) 42.

A la vista del cuadro de estas variantes, es también muy oportuno lo que Metzger (l. c.) supone: «Although the reading of $D \Theta f^{13}$ *al* without any qualifying genitive ('Then they understood that he did not tell them to beware of leaven, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees') might be thought original and each of the other readings an expansion, it is also possible that copyists considered the presence of $\tau\omega\nu \alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$ or $\tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ to be unnecessary to the sense and therefore omitted the words as superfluous. In view of the balance of transcriptional possibilities, the Committee decided to adopt the reading supported by $\kappa B L$ 892 and several early versions».

Vamos a ver ahora cómo se han definido las ediciones críticas sobre esta variante. La gran mayoría acepta la lectura $\tau\omega\nu \alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$ (²), dos se deciden por $\tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (³) y una por $\tau\omega\nu \Phi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\iota\omega\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \Sigma\alpha\delta\delta\omicron\upsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ (⁴). La totalidad, pues, de los críticos considera como más auténtica la adición del genitivo calificativo.

Se diría, sin embargo, que la duda permanece con respecto a la elección de $\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$ o $\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Para ayudar a la decisión, creo importante ver la atestación de los manuscritos en el versículo anterior, en el cual tenemos:

$\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$

$\kappa B C K L M S Y \Theta \Pi \Omega f^1 f^{13} 21 33 157 251 349 399 470 482 517$
543 (544) 565 700 713 (892) 1424 1515 *al d e f*

$\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$

$D E F G H O U V W X \Gamma \Delta \Sigma \Phi 22$ *al plur it (pler) vg sy^{ph} bo^{pt} Lcf*

Basta una sencilla ojeada para apreciar la diferente documentación de $\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$ y $\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ en 16,11 y 16,12: muy nutrida a favor de $\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$ en 16,11 y más floja en 16,12. Un punto merece especialmente destacarse. En 16,12 los antioquenos en masa leen $\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$; en cambio, en 16,11 aparecen divididos: unos (E F G H) leen $\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ y otros (K S $\Pi \Omega$) prefieren $\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$. Esta discriminación textual favorece la decisión a favor del discordante $\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$ en 16,11.

Esto supuesto, conviene apreciar la diferente posición de los manuscritos en los dos versículos confrontados:

16,11 $\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$	16,12 $\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$: B L
16,11 $\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$	16,12 $\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$: E F G H
16,11 $\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$	16,12 $\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$: K S $\Pi \Omega$
16,11 $\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$	16,12 $\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$: vg

Resulta, pues, que tanto B L como E F G H armonizan 16,12 con 16,11. En cambio, K S $\Pi \Omega$ no armonizan, como tampoco la vg, con algún otro tes-

(2) ALAND - BLACK - MARTINI - METZGER - WIKGREN³ (aceptada la variante con la letra D, es decir, con el mínimo grado de seguridad), BOVER - O'CALLAGHAN, BRANDSCHEID³, LAGRANGE, LEGG, MERK⁹, NESTLE-ALAND²⁶, SOUTER² (1950), TASKER, VOGELS², VON SODEN, WEISS², WESTCOTT-HORT ([$\tau\omega\nu \alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu$]), *Syn* ALAND⁷, *Syn* HUCK-GREEVEN¹³.

(3) HODGES-FARSTAD, SCRIVENER⁽¹⁹⁰⁸⁾.

(4) TISCHENDORF⁸.

timonio secundario, cuyo peso no puede decidir. En consecuencia, atendida la documentación y la ausencia de armonización, parecen preferibles las variantes del texto representado por K S Π Ω, teniendo presente que — según el principio de crítica racional — en igualdad de circunstancias, entre dos lecciones, armonizante una y discrepante otra, hay que inclinarse por la segunda⁽⁵⁾.

Pontificio Instituto Bíblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

José O'CALLAGHAN

(⁵) Cf. BOVER-O'CALLAGHAN, pp. XLVII-XLVIII.

“If Any Man Thirsts...”: Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7,37-39*

Introduction

Most of those familiar with traditional expositions of John 7,37-39 have encountered an explanation of the Jewish “water-pouring” ceremony⁽¹⁾. The liturgy and symbolism of this ceremony, performed at least seven times during the eight day Feast of Tabernacles, provide a strikingly relevant backdrop against which Jesus extends his dramatic invitation:

If any man thirsts, let him come to me;
and let him drink, who believes in me.
As the scripture said, “from his belly shall flow rivers of living water”⁽²⁾.

Despite the willingness of most commentators to cite assorted rabbinic texts—from Tannaitic midrashim to Talmudic excerpts—as illustrative of the first century Jewish understanding of this Feast and its water ceremony, two pertinent texts have largely been ignored⁽³⁾. The first of these, and probably the most neglected, is the 52nd *pisqa* (“section”) of the homiletic midrash,

(*) This paper was developed from material presented to the Fourth Gospel study group at the 1984 national ETS meeting (Chicago).

(1) This ceremony, performed on each of the first seven days of the Feast of Tabernacles, basically involves the ceremonial transportation of a golden flagon of water from the pool of Siloam through the Water Gate south of the temple, and up the altar ramp. At this point, the designated priest would empty the flagon into the western half of an open-drained, twin-tubbed, silver bowl (wine poured in eastern half). For detailed account, see *m. Sukk.* 4,9-10. Cf. also *Str.B.* 2,490-493.

(2) This translation is based upon an acceptance of the so-called “Western” punctuation (originally accepted by only Western church fathers such as Tertullian, Cyprian, Irenaeus) of v. 38. This involves a full stop after *ho pisteuōn eis eme* in v. 38 and no punctuation after *pinetō* in v. 37. Significantly for this study, this form of punctuation is also referred to as the “Christological” punctuation in that Christ is regarded as the source of living water.

(3) Perhaps this neglect is due to the fact that both texts underwent final redaction after the first Christian century. Yet the task of dating any rabbinic material is notoriously complex. Traditions which receive their final shape in, for example, a fifth century homiletic midrash, are not necessarily post-Christian. The tradition might date back, in a remarkably similar oral form, to pre-Christian Judaism. In any event, the present trend in published NT research reveals a proliferation of rabbinic citation, although caution must be exercised with any rabbinic text which is allowed to “inform” a NT document.

Pesiqta Rabbati⁽⁴⁾. The second often overlooked text is the third chapter (*halakoth* 3-12) of the tractate *Sukkah* in the *Tosefta*⁽⁵⁾. These texts will be examined in turn.

The focus of this study will be upon 1) both texts' distinctive insights into the rabbinic understanding of the Feast's central symbolic act—the water libation—and 2) upon *Pesiqta*'s development of a rabbinic rationale for the existence of the Feast's additional eighth day. In the process of this examination, it will be demonstrated how the insights of these two texts might enhance a “fuller” reading of John 7,37-39.

Pesiqta Rabbati 52,4,6

The 52nd chapter of *Pesiqta Rabbati* was designed as a homiletic midrash on the scripture lesson for the 'ešret, “Eighth day festival [of Tabernacles]”: “on the eighth day you shall have a solemn assembly” (Num 29,35). The focus of each of the eight sections within this chapter is upon answering the rhetorical question, “Why did God provide for us this additional eighth day?”

The relevance of this chapter for the historical setting of John 7,37-39 is obviously enhanced if, indeed, Jesus spoke his words on the *eighth* day of the feast⁽⁶⁾. His Jewish audience on that day would quite naturally have evalu-

⁽⁴⁾ Cited as *Pesiq. R.* 52,3-6. Quotes are taken from W. G. BRAUDE, *Pesikta Rabbati*, 2 vols. (New Haven 1968). This work is to be distinguished from a similar homiletic midrash, *Pesiqta deRab Kahana*, which is structurally divided into 31 homilies for the festive year rather than the 53 sections of *Pesiqta Rabbati*. For sorting out the confusing array of rabbinic citations—esp. the Tannaitic and homiletic midrashim—see B. GRIGSBY, “A Proposed Guide for Citing Rabbinic Textes” *JETS* 24 (1981) 83-91.

The text in question is somewhat difficult to date in terms of compilation in its present form. A chronological determiner in the text (777 elapsed years since destruction of temple in first century) is certainly a reader's gloss. Indeed, the greatest part of the material in the text appears to go back to Talmudic times, and traditions recorded in *Pesiqta Rabbati* can be traced yet further back. The authors of the discourses are all teachers of the third and fourth centuries; i.e., Palestinian Amoraim of the second, third, fourth, or fifth generations. To push the traditions yet further back—into the first Christian century—is an admittedly speculative endeavor, yet not a foolish one.

⁽⁵⁾ Cited as *t. Sukk.* 3,3-12. Quotes are taken from J. NEUSNER, *The Tosefta*, vol. 2 (New York 1981). At the time of this writing, five of the six projected volumes have come to press.

⁽⁶⁾ From the wording of the text—“the last day, the great [day] of the feast” (cf. p⁶⁶ for slight variation)—it is hardly more than guesswork to suggest that such phraseology refers to either the seventh or eighth day of the Feast. Certainly the words of Jesus would have added impact on the seventh day when the water ceremony was performed for the final time. See esp. the arguments to this effect offered by R. BULTMANN, *The Gospel of John. A Commentary* (Philadelphia 1971) 302, n. 5, and R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3 vols. (New York 1968-1984) 2,152.

However, one must realize, as Barrett observes, that “there is no reason why

ated Jesus' brief midrashic homily in terms of their own speculation about the significance of the eighth day (i.e., the midrashic expansion of Num 29,35 as preserved in *Pesiq. R.* 52).

The main theme of the 52nd chapter emerges most forcefully in sections four and six. In these sections the eighth day is understood both as 1) a day of great rejoicing in light of God's gracious bestowal of the season's first rains⁽⁷⁾, and 2) as a day of great anticipation in light of God's promises to pour out the spiritual "rains" of the Messianic age.

Section 4

This section develops a rationale for the eighth day by utilizing a proem text from Ecclesiastes. This text, Eccl 11,2, is embellished somewhat to accommodate its use as a commentary on Num 29,35. *Pesiqta's* version of the verse reads: "Give a portion of prosperity because of seven and also because of eight"⁽⁸⁾.

The significance of the numbers seven and eight in the proem text is informed by rabbinic speculation on the story of Elijah and the cessation of the drought (1 Kgs 18,42-44). Two reasons are cited for God's gracious provision of rain in Elijah's day. He granted rain "because of the seventh" (18,44)—i.e., the merits which accrue in keeping the sabbath—and because Elijah put his face between his knees (18,42)—i.e., the merits which accrue from observing the commandment of circumcision on the *eighth* day. To quote section 4:

These two verses from Kings intimate that Elijah said to the Holy One, blessed be He: Master of the universe, even if Israel have fulfilled no commandments other than those concerning the Sabbath and circumcision, the merit of these two is such as to have Thee send down the rain because of them.

Jesus should not have proclaimed the *true* water and light *after* [italics mine] the merely symbolic water and light had been withdrawn from the Temple" (*The Gospel according to St. John* [London 1955] 269). In addition, at least one rabbi (R. Judah), suggests that a water ceremony *was* celebrated on the eighth day (*t. Sukk.* 3,16).

(7) The origin of Tabernacles as an agricultural feast designed to implore the first rains through altar-circling rain rites has been developed by J. JEREMIAS, *TDNT*, 4,278. See in this regard *b. Roš. Haš.* 16a: "Why has the Talmud commanded, Pour out water on the feast of Tabernacles? The Holy One, blessed be He, has commanded Pour out water on the feast of Tabernacles in order that the rain (of the coming year) may bless you".

(8) In the MT, the translation runs: "Divide your portion to seven or even to eight, for you do not know what misfortune may occur on the earth". The two major differences with *Pesiqta's* rendering are 1) the person addressed is the reader rather than God, and 2) the preposition *le*, in both instances, is taken in a purely local sense ("to") rather than in a causal sense ("because"). It should be noted that the preposition *le* rarely functions in a causal sense, and even then, only when it is syntactically related to a passive verb (GKC § 121).

Thus, according to the rabbinic rationale developed in this section, the Jews awaited expectantly God's "rain" because of their combined observance of the festival proper (seven) and its additional day (eight). They, like Elijah, were conscious of their many failings but confident of God's loyal love and covenant-keeping character. Their spiritual drought, like the meteorological one during Elijah's day, would surely end. The "springs of salvation" (Isa 12,3)—at least in a proleptic sense—would soon be upon them as the "true rain" is poured out. Thus a context emerges in which the dramatic twist of Jesus' words—"if anyone thirsts let him come to me; let he who believes in me drink"—is intensified.

Section 6

In this section, a parable and subsequent haggadic expansion address the question, "Why the eighth day?" God is compared to a king who, by virtue of the merrymaking during his seven day feast, is predisposed to granting favors for his subjects. Thus the request for an additional eighth day of feasting, presented opportunistically during the feast by the royal consort on behalf of the people, is granted. So too, argues Rabbi Alexandrai, is the case with Israel and her eight day feast. Long ago, during the seven days of feasting proper, the people opportunistically requested rain from their "susceptible" God. This request was then realized through the addition of an eighth day when the rains of "prosperity" (i.e., salvation) are poured out upon a thirsty people.

The rabbi ingeniously points out that his understanding of the origin of the eighth day of Tabernacles is far from haggadic invention. His interpretation is accessible to any astute student of Torah who carefully studies the prescribed sacrifices for the first seven days (Num 29,19-33). Such a close reading of the text, he reasons, reveals that "Torah itself was hinting to Israel that during the Feast of Tabernacles was the right time to ask of God a pouring out of rain on their fields".

This "hinting" on the part of Torah derives from the unorthodox spelling of three terms in Num 29,19-33: 1) In the verse prescribing the drink offerings for the second day (v. 19), the term נסכים "their drink offerings," occurs instead of the expected נסכה, "its drink offering"⁽⁹⁾. The main difference between the two terms is the addition of the letter *mem* to the former. 2) In the verse prescribing the drink offerings for the sixth day (v. 31), the term נסכיה, "its drink offerings", occurs instead of the expected נסכה, "its drink offering"⁽¹⁰⁾. The difference here is the addition of the letter *yod* to the former term. 3) Finally, in the verse prescribing the drink offerings for

⁽⁹⁾ So Num 29,21.25.28. The "expected" form is indeed the reading, according to the critical apparatus of the Stuttgart fascicle, of 3-10 (*pauca*) manuscripts.

⁽¹⁰⁾ So Num 29,16.23.26. This "expected" form is found in 11-20 (*nonnulli*) manuscripts.

the seventh day (v. 33), the term במשפטם "after their ordinance", occurs instead of the expected במשפט "after the ordinance"⁽¹¹⁾. The difference here is the addition of the letter *mem* to the former term. These three additional letters are divinely intended by Torah as a "hint" for Israel. Rabbi Alexandrai concludes:

The variations in spelling indicated by the letter *mem* at the end of the first word, by the letter *yod* within the second word, and by the letter *mem* at the end of the third word show what the Torah is hinting at, for the three letters together spell *mym* ("water").

Tosefta, Sukkah 3,3-12

The third chapter of tractate *Sukkah*, "Tabernacles", in the Tosefta, especially *halakoth* 3-12, offers two avenues of reasoning why the Water Gate—such an integral part of the Feast's daily water ceremony—is so named. In the process, these *halakoth* provide a fascinating, often neglected⁽¹²⁾ aspect of the rabbinic interpretation of the water ceremony. Any serious exposition of John 7,37-39 ought to, at least, be aware of this text.

1) The Water Ceremony as a Symbolic Anticipation of the Eschatological Outpouring of Living Water (3,3-9)

In this portion of the chapter, the naming of the Water Gate is explained in terms of the prophetic role of the *south* gate in Ezek 47,1-9. Ezek 47,2—"...and behold, water was trickling from the south side [of the altar]"—is interpreted to mean that the eschatological outpouring of water from the new temple shall flow through the *south* gate, therefore the *water* gate. This water is recognized as flowing from underneath the temple (47,1)⁽¹³⁾, and its status as a *river* (47,5.9.12) is emphasized. Indeed, the visionary river of Ezekiel is construed as a river of *living* water, in that the eighth *halakah* identifies this water with the eschatological river of living water described in Zech 14,8. Not without significance for understanding the fourth gospel's "living water" motif, the water in Ezekiel is noted for its cleansing function (Zech 13,1 cited)⁽¹⁴⁾ and its ability to bring fish to life in

⁽¹¹⁾ So Num 29,18.20. As with the preceding term, this "expected" term has found its way into 11-20 manuscripts.

⁽¹²⁾ One prominent exception is P. GRELOT, "Jean vii.38: eau du rocher ou source du Temple", *RB* 70 (1963) 43-51.

⁽¹³⁾ One thinks immediately of the rock (Mt. Moriah) lying at the base of the temple. To be developed below, is the Johannine treatment of Jesus as not only the new temple, but also the true rock.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Zech 13,1 reads: "In that day a fountain will be opened for the house of David and for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for impurity". Thus the healing properties of Ezekiel's eschatological waters are related to the purifying or cleansing properties of Zechariah's visionary streams. In Ezek 35,25-27.33, the cleansing function of the outpoured, eschatological water is clearly spelled out.

both the dead sea and the sea of Tiberias (Sea in the *Arabah* thus interpreted—Ezek 47,8)⁽¹⁵⁾.

Against such a background of rabbinic speculation about Tabernacles' water ceremony, Jesus' words are particularly relevant: "If any man thirsts let him come to me; and let him drink who believes in me. As the Scripture said, 'From his belly shall flow rivers of living water'". His audience, perhaps just having passed through the Water Gate, would quite naturally relate the Nazarene's phrase, "rivers of living water", to those eschatological waters foretold by Ezekiel and Zechariah. Jesus' presumption in claiming *himself* as the source of these waters would indeed have startled his original audience. According to Ezekiel, these waters were to issue forth from the new temple. Yet, for the fourth evangelist, Jesus *is* the new temple⁽¹⁶⁾, and the astute reader (the *lector Johannis* rather than the *auditor Christi*)⁽¹⁷⁾ would have an awareness of this developing motif.

Here the waters serve to cleanse the faithful remnant from all filthiness. It is no surprise, then, that "living waters" (*mayim hayyim/hydōr zōn*) find a place in the Levitical cultus as a primary cleansing agent (Num 19,9,17).

For the Fourth Evangelist, the cultic dimension of "living water" is potentially developed in the footwashing account. The cleansing water applied to Peter's feet appears to anticipate the cleansing water from Christ's side, esp. if the short text is accepted—"He who has bathed has no need to wash further...". In any event, the Johannine "living waters" are only released at a sacrificial event, the cross; and their subsequent life-giving powers must certainly derive from the fact that they are mingled with the "blood" of Christ. For a development of this cultic aspect of the Johannine "living water" motif, see B. GRIGSBY, "The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel", *JSNT* 15 (1982) 61-63.

⁽¹⁵⁾ In John 21,1-11, the living waters, under the sovereign direction of their dispenser, flow into the Sea of Tiberias (Sea of Galilee so-called in NT only here and John 6,21!) and "bring to life" 153 fish for the discouraged disciples. The tumbling, life-giving streams of Ezek 47,8, as interpreted in the Tosefta tractate *Sukkah*, are very likely recalled in this episode.

This type of exegesis is admittedly "complicated and tentative" (so R. BROWN, "The Johannine Sacramentary Reconsidered", *TS* 23 [1962] 204), but it might be justified in light of the mention of the figure "153" in 21,11. This might well be a case of *gematria* wherein the evangelist construes the miraculous draught of fish as a profound realization, along rabbinic lines, of Ezekiel's vision. This was first suggested by J. A. EMERTON, "The one hundred and fifty-three fishes in John 21:11", *JTS* (1958) 86-89, and P. ACKROYD, "The 153 fishes in John 21:11— a further note", *JTS* 10 (1959) 94, and recently supported by B. GRIGSBY, "Gematria and John 21:11—Another Look at Ezekiel 47:10" *ExpTim* 95 (1984) 177-178.

⁽¹⁶⁾ John 2,21; 4,21-23; cf. Rev 21,22. In addition Jesus functions as the new Jerusalem in his capacity as the new temple (cf. same merging of roles in Rev 21,1; 22,21). The relationship between Jerusalem and the temple, with regard to this eschatological flow of living water, is extremely close in Ezek 47,1-12 and Zech 14,8.

⁽¹⁷⁾ The distinction between the *auditores Christi* and the *lectores Johannis* in the Fourth Gospel is drawn by X. LÉON-DUFOUR, "Le mystère du pain de vie", *RSR* 46 (1958) 481-523.

2) *The Water Ceremony as a Reenactment of the Wilderness Water Miracle (3,11-12)*

In this portion of the chapter, the wilderness water miracle, chronicled in Exod 17,1-7 and Num 20,8-13, and recalled in Ps 78,16-20, is interpreted typologically as a forerunner of Tabernacles' water ceremony. To accommodate this alleged thematic connection, the historical event itself is reconstrued in a way which adds relevance to the words of Jesus in John 7,37-39. The rock at Horeb is pictured as "a large round vessel, surging and gurgling upward as from the mouth of this little flask [open drain in basin at top of altar into which were poured the ceremonial waters]". This rock, quite naturally referred to as a "well" on one occasion, is given a peripatetic function, "rising with them up onto the mountain, and going down with them into the valleys"⁽¹⁸⁾. Significantly, the waters which issued forth from this peripatetic rock/well are described as a river⁽¹⁹⁾. In fact, the Targumic translation of Ps 78,16, a verse which recalls the wilderness water miracle, refers to the effluence of water from the rock at Horeb as "rivers of living water"⁽²⁰⁾.

Again, such a background infuses the words of Jesus with added meaning. He, in essence, is claiming to be *the* well, or *the* rock. This rock, like the rock at Horeb, shall soon be struck or pierced⁽²¹⁾. From this wound in his belly—as from the flask-like rock at Horeb and as from the open-drained basin at Tabernacles—he promises that rivers of living water shall gush forth⁽²²⁾. Such claims were Messianic. The duplication of the Moses water miracle by the Messiah was an eagerly anticipated event in rabbinic thought. This is clearly expressed in the midrashic commentary on Eccl 1,9⁽²³⁾. Expanding on the preacher's dictum that there is nothing new under the sun, the midrashist writes, "As the first redeemer caused the spring to arise (Moses at Horeb), so the last redeemer (Christ at Calvary) will cause water to rise up".

⁽¹⁸⁾ This somewhat mystical interpretation of the water miracle is endorsed by Paul in 1 Cor 10,4.

⁽¹⁹⁾ The wilderness waters are related to the "overflowing streams" of Ps 78,20 and the "river" of Ps 105,41.

⁽²⁰⁾ *Tg. Ket.* Ps 78,16—"He led forth streams of water from the rock and brought down, as it were, rivers of living [*living* not in MT] water". Cf. in this regard, M.-E. BOISMARD, "Les citations targumiques dans le quatrième évangile", *RB* 66 (1959) 373-376.

⁽²¹⁾ The evangelist's editorial comment, "the Spirit was not yet [given] because Jesus was not yet glorified", surely refers to Jesus' supreme moment of glorification in the Fourth Gospel, the cross. Thus, only on John's calvary, is Jesus pierced with a spear, followed by an effluence of blood and water.

⁽²²⁾ Might the Johannine phrase in 19,34, *exēlthen euthys* "immediately came out [water]", be a euphemism for a "stronger" Aramaic term, on the order of "gush forth?" D. M. Ford believes so, citing *znq* as an Aramic precursor to the Johannine expression ("Mingled blood' from the side of Christ", *NTS* 15 [1969] 337-338.

⁽²³⁾ *Qoh. Rab.* 1,9 § 1.

Conclusion

From the standpoint of anyone endeavoring to exegete John 7,37-39, the two rabbinic texts discussed above provide a valuable insight into the rabbinic understanding of the great feast and its central symbolic act, the water ceremony. Assuming that the earliest Jewish audiences (both those who heard Jesus and those who read the Fourth Gospel) 1) had access to these traditions, either in written or oral form, and 2) focused upon these traditions during the eight day feast and especially during the seven daily water ceremonies, then the cry of Jesus in such a context becomes profoundly relevant.

Were the Jews, confident in the gracious disposition of their God, awaiting the joyous advent of the season's first rains which would end their spiritual drought, herald the age of Messianic prosperity, and symbolically fill the wells of salvation (*Pesiq. R.* 52)? Jesus cries out that He himself will graciously provide "rain" which will bring life in the Spirit to all who drink. Were the Jews, engrossed in the symbolism of the water ceremony, longing for the time when the eschatological waters envisioned by Ezekiel and Zechariah would trickle forth from the rock underneath the new temple, gathering strength into rivers of living water as they passed through the Water Gate (*T. Sukk.* 3)? Jesus cries out that these eschatological torrents of living water will flow from *him*, the new temple, the pierced rock. Were the Jews, again reflecting upon their water ceremony and its historical roots, confident of a future reenactment of the wilderness water miracle? Only this time it would be brought about by the second redeemer and would result in an outpouring of the Divine Spirit for all to drink. True to the preacher's dictum, "there is nothing new under the sun", Jesus assumes the role of this second redeemer⁽²⁴⁾. On Calvary rather than at Horeb He is the new Moses and from his pierced side will flow the Divine Spirit for all to drink⁽²⁵⁾.

Biola University
Brea, CA 92621
USA

Bruce H. GRIGSBY

⁽²⁴⁾ Not coincidentally, some of the throngs of religious pilgrims who heard these words were saying, "this is the Christ" (v. 41).

⁽²⁵⁾ The evangelist editorially informs the less astute among his readership that Jesus' invitation indeed concerns drinking of the *Spirit* (v. 39).

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICA

Auf der Suche nach der Geschichte⁽¹⁾

Endlich einmal wieder ein Buch über das Alte Testament, das sich nicht in exegetischen, archäologischen oder sogenannten redaktionskritischen Details verliert, sondern den Mut zur Gesamtsicht riskiert! Der amerikanische Alttestamentler van Seters, von dem schon manche provokatorische These ausgegangen ist, hat wieder einen sehr eigenwilligen, überaus gelehrten Entwurf vorgelegt. Auch dem kundigen Leser beschert jede Seite des Buches eine neue Einsicht, und sei es in der Weise, daß ein bewußter Widerspruch zur These des Verfassers entsteht.

Der Begriff Geschichte war der akademischen Welt Europas, den Theologen und noch mehr den Nichttheologen, im späten 19. Jh. ein verehrungswürdiges Wort. Damals verband sich damit die Überzeugung, geschichtliches Bewußtsein und historische Forschung sei eine der großen und unvergänglichen Leistungen der alten Griechen und eine der höchsten Errungenschaften des menschlichen Geistes. Noch für M. Grant (*"The Ancient Historians"* 1970; dt. *"Klassiker der antiken Geschichtsschreibung"* 1973) "bleibt unbestritten, daß die Geschichtswissenschaft, so wie wir heute den Begriff gebrauchen, eine Erfindung der Griechen ist" und daß ihre Erfindung "auf den ersten Blick... wie ein Wunder" anmutet (Vorwort). Demgegenüber haben im Anschluß an den Althistoriker Eduard Meyer um die Mitte unseres Jahrhunderts Alttestamentler wie A. Alt, M. Noth und G. v. Rad mit Nachdruck die These vertreten, daß das Denken in geschichtlichen Kategorien, verbunden mit einem linearen teleologischen Zeitverständnis, nirgends anders als in Israel entstanden, ja daß Geschichte geradezu das beherrschende Thema des gesamten Alten Testaments sei. "Das Alte Testament ist ein Geschichtsbuch" (G. v. Rad, *Theologie des AT*, 8II [1984] 380). Von daher erscheinen die umgebenden Kulturen und Religionen grundsätzlich ungeschichtlich orientiert, befangen in zyklischem Kreislaufdenken. Es ist das Verdienst der neuen Veröffentlichung van Seters', mit solchen einseitigen Urteilen hoffentlich einmal aufzuräumen. Von Geschichte in gewissem Sinne ist durchaus schon in Mesopotamien und Ägypten die Rede. Israelitische und griechische Geschichtsschreibung unterscheiden sich davon zwar graduell, indem sie eine regelrechte Gattung von Geschichtsschreibung ausbilden, aber nicht grundsätzlich. Das Buch sollte zur Pflichtlektüre für alle werden, die über die Rolle der Geschichte in der Religion des alten Israels, oder über das Verhältnis des

⁽¹⁾ John VAN SETERS, *In Search of History. Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. xiv-399 p. New Haven and London 1983. Yale University Press.

Alten Testamentes zu seiner religionsgeschichtlichen Umwelt oder über die Beziehung zwischen Bibel und Hellenismus nachzudenken bereit sind. Mit bewundernswerter Kenntnis der Primärquellen und Sekundärliteratur wird das einschlägige Material nach dem gegenwärtigen Stand der jeweiligen Einzelforschung vor dem Leser eindrucksvoll ausgebreitet. Das schließt freilich nicht ein, daß ein skeptischer Leser durch van Seters' Deutung des Materials an allen Stellen überzeugt werden wird.

Das einleitende Kap. 1 gibt eine Definition von Geschichtsschreibung und beschreibt das methodische Vorgehen. Für das erste wird ein Satz des holländischen Kulturphilosophen J. Huizinga zugrunde gelegt: "History is the intellectual form in which a civilization renders account to itself of its past". Für das zweite aber verschreibt sich van Seters der Gattungsforschung: "The approach, first of all, is to concentrate on genre analysis". Das sind diskutablen Vorgaben. Der Teufel steckt, wie so oft im Detail. Was van Seters nämlich erläuternd hinzufügt, kann nicht in gleicher Weise Zustimmung erwarten. So wird Huizingas "civilization" bei van Seters im Handumdrehen zur "nation", und die Rechenschaftslegung über die kollektive Verantwortung für bisheriges Geschehen nicht nur zu einer forensischen Beurteilung, sondern auch zum Mittel der Identitätsfindung einer Nation. Läßt sich aber hinsichtlich des alten Mesopotamien oder Ägyptens von einer Nation reden? Darf man den individualpsychologischen Begriff der Identität ohne Einschränkung auf gewachsene geschichtliche Kulturen übertragen? Selbst wenn das möglich ist, bleibt dennoch zu klären, wieweit "History" für solche Vorgänge der Selbstfindung kollektiver Größen im Altertum konstitutiv war. Hatten hierfür nicht Mythen eine ungleich wichtigere Bedeutung? Haben die Hellenen ihre Identität nicht vor allem in Homers Ilias und die Babylonier im Enuma elisch gefunden, beides Texte, die von der Vergangenheit handeln, aber als nicht-historisch bei van Seters ausgeklammert werden? So paßt das Eingangskapitel mit seinen grundsätzlichen Bestimmungen sich so sehr modernem westlichen Commonsense an und erhebt ihn zu einem Vorverständnis, das nicht hinterfragt wird, daß die Gefahr anachronistischer Verzeichnung antiker Texte kaum vermeidbar erscheint.

Zweifel erweckt auch die kategorische Abweisung jeder Berücksichtigung eines Geschichtsbewußtseins in antiken Sprachen, einer "idea of history". Mit Nachdruck wehrt Vf. jeden Versuch ab, "to reconstruct the mind of 'Mesopotamian man' or the Egyptian view of history" (7), eine solche Uniformität könne keiner Kultur auferlegt werden (imposed). Zwar ist es begreiflich, daß van Seters an dieser Stelle Zurückhaltung an den Tag legt. Denn entsprechende Versuche haben manche Theologen und Geisteswissenschaftler zu gewagten Spekulationen verführt. Verfällt er aber nicht, um der Skylla zu entinnen, der Charybdis einer anachronistischen Sicht, die den amerikanischen "life-style" zur Denkvoraussetzung gesunder Menschen überhaupt und damit auch antiker Historiker erhebt? Schon die Auswahl dessen, was als 'history' zu gelten hat, bestärkt solchen Verdacht. So wird für van Seters "objectivity of presentation" zum Maßstab dessen, was mesopotamisch als Geschichtsschreibung angesehen werden kann (56), während ein "unscientific belief", daß übernatürliche Kräfte die Geschichte des Einzelnen oder der Gruppe schaffen und mit ihnen kommuniziert werden kann, von vornherein die ak-

kadische Omenliteratur aus dem Bereich möglicher historischer Literatur ausschließt (77). In solchen Sätzen wird eine bestimmte, wenngleich dominierende Sicht positivistischer Historie der Neuzeit zum absoluten Maßstab. Nimmt man solche Vorgaben beim Wort, darf man dann überhaupt noch von irgendwelchen antiken Texten, einschließlich der griechischen, Historiographie erwarten? Nach Meinung des Rezensenten genügt eine an Huizinga angelehnte Definition keineswegs, um Geschichte oder Geschichtsschreibung von anderen Geistesbeschäftigungen, etwa Epen und Mythen, hinreichend abzugrenzen. Vielmehr läßt sich nur dort von Geschichte reden, wo für kollektives wie individuelles Leben mit einer unumkehrbaren Geschehenskette gerechnet wird, die sich durch die Zeiten fortsetzt und bei der eine Folge von Ursachen und Wirkungen – seien sie immanent, seien sie metahistorisch – aufgewiesen werden (vgl. Artikel "Geschichte" II, TRE 12, 569-586).

Das zweite Kapitel behandelt frühe *griechische Geschichtsschreibung*. Es stellt also voran, was im Vergleich mit den nachfolgenden Kapiteln, chronologisch gesehen, ans Ende gehört. Die Voranstellung begründet van Seters nicht. Für ihn erklärt sie sich wahrscheinlich einmal aus der üblichen Antithese von hebräischem und griechischem Denken, die gleich zu Anfang abgelehnt werden soll, aber auch aus den interessanten Folgerungen für alttestamentliche Geschichtsschreibung, die gerade aus griechischem Vergleichsmaterial gezogen werden sollen. Im Zentrum steht Herodot. Denn Herodot ist für van Seters in vieler Hinsicht dem deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk vergleichbar (17). Eindrucksvoll wird Herodot in die griechische Geistesgeschichte des 6. und 5. Jh. v. Chr. eingeordnet, wo hellenische Schriftsteller allgemein auf der Suche nach den ersten *aitiai* sind. Dadurch entsteht bei ihm eine ätiologisch ausgerichtete Geschichtsschreibung, "etiology is a necessary precursor to historiography" (25). Als Thema des "Vaters der Historie" gilt (nach Immerwahr) die Einigung Asiens durch die Perser und ihr hybrider Versuch, das Reich über die Grenzen des Kontinents auszudehnen. Dabei werden die menschlichen Ursachen letztlich in Ungerechtigkeit und Hybris gesucht, worauf göttliche Vergeltung (*tisis*) notwendig folgt. Eine erschöpfende Darstellung von Aufbau und Anliegen des herodoteischen Werkes fehlt freilich, da für van Seters das Gewicht auf den Parallelen zum Alten Testament liegt. Die Darstellung des griechischen Textes wird deshalb durch Querverweise wieder und wieder unterbrochen. Da geht es einmal um das Verhältnis der Epen zur prosaischen Geschichtsdarstellung; weder in Griechenland noch in Israel (gegen Albright) läßt sich ein Nacheinander beider Gattungen nachweisen. Zum andern stellt sich die Frage nach der Einheitlichkeit angesichts von Doppelungen und Widersprüchen. Van Seters wehrt die Versuche ab, jede Parataxis überlieferungsgeschichtlich zu erklären. Die Verbindung der Einheiten kann nicht als "redaktionell" beschrieben werden, weil dadurch das "compositional work" übersehen wird (51). Herodot ist so wenig "merely a redactor" wie der alttestamentliche Historiker (58). Wo der Grieche sich auf Quellen beruft, ist das teilweise literarische Schablone. Vieles was Herodot selbst gesehen und gehört haben will, hat er aus Hekataios abgeschrieben (44), anderes frei erfunden. Daraus folgt für van Seters der kühne Schluß, "that identifying a genre does not tell us anything about its 'original' Sitz im Leben or the process of transmission of a particular story or narrative unit" (49).

Noch nie hat ein Alttestamentler sich so eingehend mit griechischer Geschichtsschreibung befaßt. Es gelingt dem Vf. an einigen Stellen tatsächlich, überraschende und überzeugende Querlinien zu alttestamentlichen Tatbeständen aufzuweisen. Wird aber das griechische Material selbst dadurch verkürzt dargeboten und allzusehr in Richtung einer Analogie zum Alten Testament gedrängt? Gewiß ist es ein Stück weit richtig: "Like Herodotus, the Old Testament exhibits a dominant concern with the issue of divine retribution for unlawful acts as a fundamental principle of historical causality" (39). Eingedenk des ersten Kapitels fragt aber der Leser, ob das schon Geschichtsschreibung sein kann und nicht unter den "unscientific" Zugang fällt, den van Seters anderweitig entschieden abgewiesen hatte. Aus jenem Satz folgt schnell: "For both, history is theodicy". Herodots soziologischer und mythologischer Kontext bleibt unberücksichtigt, ebenso die semantischen Implikationen, etwa die Rede vom Neid (*phthonos*) der Götter, von der Verblendung (*ate*) der Herrschenden, von kausal unerklärlichem Einwirken der Tyche u.a. Das letzte sind Themen, die doch wohl aus einer Eigenart griechischen Denkens herrühren, das es nach van Seters nicht geben darf. Erst recht fällt jeder Hinweis auf den (griechisch verbreiteten) Gedanken ewiger Wiederkehr unter den Tisch. Heißt es bei Herodot (1,207): "Der Kreislauf menschlicher Dinge, der immer kreist und nicht duldet, daß immer diese glücklich sind", so heißt es umgekehrt bei van Seters (8) "no cyclic view of time is evident in the Greek histories" (vgl. dagegen Thukydides I 22 oder zu Polybios K. Löwith, *Meaning in History* [1949] [dt. *Weltgeschichte und Heilsgeschehen* (21953) 17]).

Das dritte Kapitel ist *Mesopotamien* gewidmet. Hier hat in den letzten Jahren Grayson durch seine Textausgaben eine verlässliche Basis geschaffen. Ihm folgt van Seters im wesentlichen und untersucht a) Königsinschriften, b) Königslisten, c) Omina, d) Chroniken, e) historische Epen und f) Profetien, jeweils mit knapper Inhaltsangabe und bezeichnenden Beispielen. Soweit ich sehe, wird alle einschlägige Literatur berücksichtigt und höchst abwägend beurteilt. Über Grayson hinaus werden die babylonischen Chroniken über die Frühzeit (vor Nabunassar 747 v. Chr.), etwa die Chronik über die frühen Könige (AOT 335-337; ANET 266f.), mit erwägenswerten Gründen in die Spätzeit datiert und gerade dadurch zum Zeugnis eines historischen Bewußtseins. "The genre of chronicle writing... actually began in the Neo-Babylonian period, and its main source was the series of astronomical diaries" (90). Auch die assyrische Königsliste (ANET 564-566) wird jünger als sonst angesetzt, nämlich in später mittellassyrischer Zeit; sie will beweisen, daß ein einheitliches assyrisches Königtum von Anfang an vorhanden war — gerade als künstliche Schöpfung ist sie "product of research" (76).

Zweifelloos gelingt van Seters der Nachweis, daß es in Assyrien und Babylonien eine historische Beschäftigung mit der Vergangenheit gegeben hat. Kein Alttestamentler sollte das künftig übersehen. Fraglich bleiben die Antriebe dafür und die Zielsetzung. Da van Seters in der Einleitung ausdrücklich abgewiesen hatte, sich mit dem Geist des mesopotamischen Menschen zu beschäftigen, kann er auf alle Bezugnahmen zu nichthistorischer mesopotamischer Literatur und vor allem zur Mythologie verzichten. So fällt es leicht, sich Grayson's Urteil anzuschließen, in diesen Texten werde "history... for his-

tory's sake" betrieben. Das ist ein Satz, der in modernen Ohren nicht nur angenehm klingt, sondern auch keines Beweises zu bedürfen scheint, weil er via negationis gewonnen wird. Da scheinbar keine Interessen erkennbar sind, haben die Babylonier die Forschung um der Forschung willen betrieben. Nun mag es in der Tat im westlichen Kulturkreis der Neuzeit Wissenschaftler geben, die Geschichte *sine ira et studio* erforschen wollen, obwohl ihre Zahl sicher gering ist gegenüber denen, die solches zu tun vorgeben. Es fällt jedoch schwer, Analoges sich im Altertum vorzustellen. (Für Herodot trifft es gewiß nicht zu.) Wäre also nicht, ehe man zu so kühnen modernistischen Folgerungen schreitet, zu untersuchen, ob die in den Königslisten und Chroniken zutage tretende Auffassung von einem einheitlichen Königtum (*šarrūtu*) für die ganze Menschheit, das allein den Frieden der Erde gewährleistet, was gelegentlich zu einer Dyarchie der babylonischen und assyrischen "Kulturnationen" abgewandelt wird, einem spezifisch mesopotamischen Menschenverständnis entspricht? Diese Überzeugung herrscht nicht nur bereits in der sumerischen Königsliste vor oder auch in der assyrischen Königsliste (70.76), sondern wird in vielen Königsinschriften zum Ausdruck gebracht. Wichtiger erscheint die andere Frage, ob die Kategorien von heilvollen und unheilvollen Zeiten sowie vom Wechsel der "Dynastien" (so die übliche ungenaue Übersetzung von akkadisch *palū*) nicht in der akkadischen Rede vom Geschick (*šimtu*), das die Götter gemäß dem Grundplan des Kosmos (*uṣurtu*) bestimmt haben, ihre Wurzel hat. Das Letzte ist eine Auffassung, die nicht nur in babylonisch-assyrischen Omina, Riten und Mythen sich findet. Solange solche Bezüge angesichts betonter Wendungen in den Texten nicht untersucht sind, steht die Grayson-van Seters-Deutung in Verdacht, einen *Western view of history* einer Kultur des Altertums zu unterlegen, um sich das Geschäft der Auslegung zu ersparen und einen möglichen garstigen historischen Graben zu überdecken.

Was über die *Hethiter* im vierten Kapitel geschrieben wird, weckt wieder Bewunderung vor der Belesenheit des Autors und seiner Kenntnis der Fachliteratur. Der Inhalt der hethitischen Annalen und die sonstigen Verweise auf die Vergangenheit, vor allem auch in den Bündnisverträgen mit Vasallen, werden eingehend vorgeführt. Hethitische Texte sind in der jüngsten Vergangenheit oft als Zeugnis eines erstaunlich fortgeschrittenen historischen Bewußtseins gewertet worden, als Darstellung historischer Kausalitäten, wie sie höchstens noch in Israel nachzuweisen und dem übrigen alten Orient fremd sind. Van Seters weist einen solchen Vorrang der Hethiter entschieden zurück. Obwohl andere Gattungen als in Mesopotamien verwendet werden, sind die frühen historischen Texte von akkadischen Königsinschriften und -epen abhängig. Wo auf Geschichte zurückverwiesen wird, da geschieht das aus praktischen Gründen. So die Annalen beispielsweise, die die Könige wegen ihrer Großtaten als Großkönige legitimieren wollen: "a king with no manly deeds is no king" (122). Die historischen Prologe in den Bundesverträgen führen Geschehenes aus der Vergangenheit nur als Präzedenzfall an, um den Vasallen von einer sinnvollen Unterwerfung zu überzeugen. Nirgends läßt sich "history... for its own sake" erkennen (122), was zur Schlußfolgerung führt: "there are no Hittite histories" (122). Zudem gibt es, wie gleich anfangs im Anschluß an Hoffner ausgeführt worden war, keine "Hittite philoso-

phy of history", sondern nur unterschiedliche Blickwinkel einzelner Autoren (102). Auch hier wünscht sich der Leser, zumal dann, wenn er gegenüber dem akademischen Ideal einer Geschichtswissenschaft um der Geschichtswissenschaft willen Vorbehalte hegt, einige semantische Untersuchungen vorgeführt zu bekommen. Welchen Stellenwert haben die vielberufenen "männlichen Taten" (*pišnatar*) in anderen hethitischen Texten? Und wie steht es mit der eigenartigen hethitischen Auffassung von Gerechtigkeit (*parā ḫandandatar*), die in den Texten der Großreichszeit als Maßstab geschichtlicher "Entwicklung" immer mehr eine Rolle spielt? Van Seters erwähnt den letzten Begriff einmal (108), ohne ihm weiter nachzugehen.

Im Blick auf das fünfte Kapitel, *Ägypten*, kann der Rezensent sich kurz fassen. Gegen die weitverbreitete Meinung, die Ägypter hätten von Geschichte keine Vorstellung gehabt, wird mit Recht auf Königslisten ("a strong historical concern" [138]) und Königsinschriften hingewiesen. Im Unterschied zu den übrigen Kapiteln wird über rein geschichtliche Gattungen hinausgegangen und Texte wie die Weisheitslehre des Merikare oder die Profetie des Neferti ("The Use of Past as Propaganda") einbezogen. Ein Seitenblick auf semantisch zentrale Begriffe fehlt wieder, wie z. B. auf die Weltordnung Ma'at, um deren Erhaltung es doch in vielen dieser Texte vordringlich geht, oder auf die von E. Hornung herausgestellten Leitidee von "Geschichte als Fest" (Darmstadt 1966). — Kapitel sechs listet auf, was in "Texts and Inscriptions of the Levant" sich an zerstreuten historiografischen Angaben findet, etwa die Idrimi-Inschrift oder die bei Josefus erhaltenen Tyros-Annalen.

Fast die Hälfte des Buches (209-361) beschäftigt sich mit einer möglichen Geschichtsschreibung in Israel. Ziel ist der Nachweis, daß der Deuteronomist der erste Historiker in Israel gewesen sei. Das siebte Kapitel behandelt bisherige Versuche, vor allem durch Gunkel, Greßmann, v. Rad und Noth auf drei Gebieten so etwas wie "Geschichte" im Alten Testament zu konstatieren: a) in historischen Erzählungen, die meist ätiologische Zielsetzung haben, b) in Schriftwerken mit biblischer Geschichte wie J oder Dtr, c) in Äußerungen eines Geschichtsbewußtseins, das sich unabhängig von der literarischen Form äußert. — Was a) Geschichtserzählung betrifft, wird unter Berufung auf Childs und Long ein ursprünglich ätiologischer Charakter der entsprechenden Texte bestritten, woraus für van Seters folgt, daß die Erzählungen weder vorliterarischer noch vorstaatlicher Herkunft sind. Hinzu tritt die Behauptung "It is quite possible to have a historical narration of events which does not begin with a tension and does not have a resolution" (224), wofür aber kein Beispiel angegeben wird. Hinsichtlich b) angebliche Geschichtswerke, wird vor allem v. Rads und Noths Darstellung des Jahwisten herangezogen. Die These eines aus alten Bekenntnissen hervorgewachsenen Werkes über die Heilsgeschichte (v. Rad) wird abgetan mit der Behauptung eines "thoroughly Deuteronomic character of the credos" (229). Es spricht aber für das Problembewußtsein des Vf. s, daß er den überraschenden Schluß des jahwistischen Werkes mit der Landnahme als erklärungsbedürftig ansieht: "Why would anyone write a history of a period in the distant past, especially one so comprehensive in scope as the Yahwistic work, if it did not make any connection with the Yahwist's own time?" (234). Der Exeget steht vor der Alternative, daß J entweder durch Samuel und Könige weitergelaufen ist (Eißfeldt, Hölscher)

oder daß J bereits ein Buch über die Zeit von der Landnahme bis zur Gegenwart vorgelegen hat, an das er sich anlehnte; die letzte Möglichkeit bevorzugt van Seters. Eine dritte Möglichkeit, die sich aus dem altorientalischen Umkreis nahelegen könnte, nämlich daß der biblische Schriftsteller eine Darstellung der stiftenden Urzeit (hebräisch *qādām*) beabsichtigt, wie sie anderwärts durch Mythen gegeben wird, hier aber ins menschliche Geschehen überführt wird, zieht er nicht in Betracht. — Zu c) Geschichtsbewußtsein in Israel überhaupt äußert sich van Seters zurückhaltend, durchmustert aber kritisch bisherige Thesen, von denen allein Albrektson's leicht geschürzte These Zustimmung findet von der "Divine intervention in history" allüberall im Alten Orient.

Nach dieser kritischen Revue ist der Leser gespannt, was van Seters seinerseits über israelitische Geschichtsschreibung denkt. Das aber wird in den drei folgenden Kapiteln nicht direkt verhandelt. Vielmehr wenden sie sich fast ausschließlich literarkritischen Problemen zu. Was van Seters schreibt, ist von der Absicht geleitet, den Deuteronomisten als Erstverfasser dieser Bücher herauszuarbeiten und das so, daß jede Suche nach Quellen oder vorliegenden mündlichen Überlieferungen sich als überflüssig erweist. Nun lassen sich die vieldiskutierten literarischen Probleme nicht auf gut 100 Seiten (249-353) erschöpfend behandeln. Was dargelegt wird, hat weithin programmatischen Charakter, stellt aber einige neue Gesichtspunkte heraus und ist für jede künftige Literarkritik der Bücher Josua bis 2. Könige bedenkenswert.

Die *Samuelbücher* (Kap. 8) werden nicht nur vor Könige (Kap. 9), sondern auch vor Josua und Richter (Kap. 10) behandelt, denn "the heart of the discussion lies in the literary analysis of the Books of Samuel and, in particular, of the Story of Saul, the Story of David's Rise, and the Succession Story (or Court History)" (247). Die Analyse der *Saulgeschichte* folgt herkömmlichen Bahnen, indem in Kap. 9-11; 13f.; mit *folk-tales* gerechnet und die jüngere Stufe in 1 Sam 8-12* als deuteronomistisch eingestuft wird. Neu ist die These, daß 15,1-16,13; 28,3-25 nachdeuteronomistische Einfügungen darstellen. Davids *Aufstieg*, 16,14 einst anhebend, war von vornherein Fortsetzung der (dtr) Saulgeschichte mit "climax" in 2 Sam 7. Ergebnis: "The notion of the Davidic promise of a perpetual dynasty... is no older than the Dtr history" (276).

Gespannt wartet der Leser an dieser Stelle darauf, wie die *Thronfolgeschichte* beurteilt wird, für viele Gelehrte nicht nur der Anfang, sondern auch der Höhepunkt alttestamentlicher Geschichtsschreibung. Van Seters, der lieber von Court History redet, setzt auch hier zum deuteronomistischen Kahlschlag an. Ausgegangen wird von den allgemeinen als deuteronomistisch eingestuften Abschnitten 1 Kön 2,1-4 und 10-12. Beide sind mit dem Hinweis auf Davids Tod aber für den Kontext unentbehrlich. Also kann die Entstehung nur umgekehrt zur bisherigen Ansicht verlaufen sein, nämlich so, daß eine vorliegende ältere deuteronomistische Rahmennotiz um die ausführliche Erzählung erweitert worden ist. Der Gedanke, daß 2,1-4.10-12 Dtr vielleicht eine ältere einfache Aussage durch sein Schema ersetzt hat, taucht nicht einmal als Frage auf. Da zudem die Aufstiegsgeschichte vorausgesetzt wird, erweist sich die Thronfolge oder Hofgeschichte um David als "post-dtr addition", nicht älter als Mitte des 6. Jh. s., eine "antilegitimation story... a bitter attack upon the whole royal ideology of a 'sure house' for David" (289f.).

An der Überzeugungskraft dieser Analyse hängt van Seters' gesamte Theorie über die israelitische Geschichtsschreibung. Zugleich tritt seine Achillesferse zutage. Die Lösung räumt die Schwierigkeit aus der Welt, daß der David verherrlichende Dtr eine so abschätzbare Zeichnung des Königs seinem Werk einverleiht hat. Ruft sie aber nicht eine Fülle neuer Schwierigkeiten historischer Art hervor? Es fällt schwer, in der gesamten nachexilischen Literatur auch nur eine entfernte Parallele zu Sprache, Gottes- und Menschenverständnis des zweiten Teils von Samuel zu finden. Aus der mutmaßlichen Mitte des 6. Jh. s kennt der Rezensent nur ein antiroyalistisches Werk — die Priesterschrift. Wie anders wird jedoch in ihr das Geschehen unter Menschen verkettet! Ehe es nicht gelingt, die Court History in den Verhältnissen und Tendenzen nachexilischer Zeit zu verorten, hängt die These in der Luft.

Für die *Königsbücher* wird mit Königslisten, Chroniken, (verlorenen) Königsinschriften sowie umlaufenden Profetenerzählungen als Vorlagen gerechnet, die aber nicht im einzelnen ausgesondert werden. Wieder ist van Seters bestrebt, möglichst viel dem Deuteronomium zuzuschreiben, dessen Einheitlichkeit gegen moderne Zerteilungsversuche festgehalten wird. So sind z. B. die Tempelbaubeschreibung 1 Kön 6–8 "completely the work of Dtr" (310) ebenso die Elijageschichten oder der Bericht über Joschias Reform (Der Buchfund "pure fiction") (319). Am Ende des Kap. 6 flicht van Seters einige Bemerkungen über den Charakter der dtr Geschichtsschreibung ein. Entgegen Noth, v. Rad u.a. gibt er kein einheitliches Anliegen, sondern "different concerns in a loose association with each other" (321). Von den *concerns* wird aber keiner entfaltet.

Für *Josua*, *Richter* und *1 Sam 1.7* müht sich van Seters um den Nachweis, daß die Grundlage dtr sei. Alle Texte, die J (etwa Jos 24) oder P (z. B. Jos 13–20) zuzuschreiben sind, hängen von Dtr ab.

Die letzten acht Seiten geben *Conclusions*. "It was Dtr himself who collected his material and put it into the sequence and chronological scheme in which it now appears from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings" (356) mit der Absicht "to communicate through this story of the people's past a sense of their identity" (359). Die vielverhandelte Frage, ob es nach Meinung von Dtr für das Volk noch eine Hoffnung gibt, wird kurz berührt und mit "perhaps" bedacht (359). So kann das Buch mit dem stolzen Satz schließen (362): "I hope I have demonstrated that the first Israelite historian, and the first known historian in Western civilization (Singular!) truly to deserve this designation, was the Deuteronomistic historian".

Ungemein angeregt, aber leicht verwirrt legt der Rezensent das Buch aus der Hand. Eine Fülle von Material wird in den einzelnen Kapiteln ausgebreitet und konsequent interpretiert. Für die altorientalischen Kapitel darf sich van Seters der Zustimmung derer sicher sein, die eine Untersuchung von Geschichtsbewußtsein oder -verständnis in diesen Kulturen für ein Haschen nach Wind halten und sich mit der Feststellung von Ansätzen zu einer — wie immer auch definierten — Geschichtsschreibung begnügen. Im Blick auf den alttestamentlichen Teil bleibt zu rühmen, daß der Vf. auf Übersicht und Zusammenhänge bedacht ist und auf alle spekulativen, sogenannten literarkritische Scheidungen von Versen, Halb- und Viertelsversen verzichtet. Ob jedoch der Deuteronomismus der Grund- und Eckstein alttestamentlicher Lite-

ratur ist, muß noch durch eingehende Form- und Sprachuntersuchungen geklärt werden. So wie er heute weithin — auch in diesem Werk — *apater, amater, agenealogetos* auftaucht, ist er alles andere als eine historische Erscheinung.

Der Rezensent ist sich mit dem Vf. einig, daß die Formkritik den Schlüssel für die Suche nach Geschichte im Alten Orient und in Israel bietet. Doch die Gattungen haben innerhalb der Gesamtkompetenz der jeweiligen Sprache nicht nur eine soziologische, sondern auch eine semantische Funktion. Es ist deshalb nur die konsequente Fortführung der Formkritik, wenn der Semantik entscheidender Worte und Wendungen innerhalb der Gattungen nachgegangen wird. Solange das nicht möglich ist, bleiben wir für ein so heikles Thema wie Geschichte und Geschichtsschreibung in einem vorläufigen Stadium. Daß wir aber dieses wenigstens erreichen, dazu gibt van Seters Hilfestellung wie kein anderer vor ihm.

Sedanstr. 19
D - 2 Hamburg 13

Klaus KOCH

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

P. Kyle McCARTER, Jr., *II Samuel* (The Anchor Bible 9). xviii-553 p.
Garden City, NY 1984. Doubleday & Co., Inc. \$ 18.00.

This volume provides a worthy supplement to McCarter's commentary on 1 Samuel which appeared in the same series in 1980. The work opens with an extended introduction which deals principally with M.'s understanding of the composition history of 2 Samuel. On this point, M. distinguishes three main strata lying behind the book in its final form: 1) various documents from the time of David (the story of David's rise, 1 Sam 16,14-2 Sam 5,10; the account of Abishalom's revolt, 2 Sam 13-20, and a sequence concerning David's dealings with Saul's house, 2 Sam 21,1-14; 9,1-13); a prophetic redaction (comprising 2 Sam 7*; 11,2-12,24; 24*) from the eighth century, and 3) a pre-exilic Deuteronomistic redaction (Dtr¹). The primary novelty here concerns the second of these strata; this in fact represents a variation of Dietrich's and Veijola's exilic "DtrP" which M. holds to be rather a pre-Deuteronomistic and pre-exilic composition.

In the commentary proper M. breaks the book down into forty fairly short units. Each unit is analysed according to a schema comprising four segments: translation, textual notes, notes (remarks on individual expressions, etc.), "comments" (discussions of questions of e.g., the intention of a passage, its historicity, etc.). The whole is rounded off with a Bibliography and a helpful series of maps and indexes.

There is much to appreciate in this work. M.'s translation has a pleasingly unaffected quality, suitable to the rough-and-tumble character of so much of 2 Samuel's subject matter. His own writing is simple and clear. Throughout M. exhibits a winning sobriety and modesty, admitting his inability to solve a number of problems and his changes of mind from his 1 Samuel commentary. The erudition of M.'s text-critical segments leave the non-specialist overwhelmed, while his consistent adducing of older authors and extra-biblical material give his work depth and breadth. Finally, this is a book which has obviously been proof-read with a good deal of care; the reviewer noted only a few typographical errors, e.g. C. G. Gordon's *Ugaritic Textbook*⁴ is from 1965, not 1910 (p. xvii).

Naturally in a book of such length, every reader will find items that he would have handled differently. This reviewer questions the necessity of M.'s revocalizing MT's *šibṭê* ("tribes") as *šōbēṭê* ("staff bearers") in 2 Sam 7,7. Similarly, while he applauds M.'s reaction against the over-facile attri-

bution of large portions of Samuel to various Deuteronomistic hands in some contemporary criticism (by Veijola in particular), he wonders whether M. himself is still referring too much to his Deuteronomist (thus, e.g., it is not clear that the language of the redactional formulations in 3,28-29; 5,1-2 should be called specifically Deuteronomistic). In various instances the "Comments" leave one with a sense of something missing, e.g., the treatment of the segment "The Rape of Tamar" (13,1-22) on pp. 327-328 incredibly has nothing to say about the hapless Tamar herself.

The reviewer's primary difficulty is not, however, so much with this commentary in particular as with the series of which it is a part, i.e., the absence of a segment corresponding to the "Ziel" section of the (equally technical) *Biblischer Kommentar* in which some attempt is made to work out the theology and anthropology of a given passage. This lacuna is all the more regrettable in that the Anchor Bible series has become a major resource also for persons in the English speaking world who are involved with the Bible in other than professional exegetical ways (in fact the series is advertised in the United States as a reference work for family Bible study). Is it, however, fair and responsible to this large group of potential readers to give them pages and pages of closely printed text-critical discussion, but not a single explicit word about what these texts might be saying about the God-human relationship, both "back then" and today? One understands very well that the task of Scriptural "actualization" is a difficulty, tricky business; one understands less well its not even being attempted.

Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C. 20064
U.S.A.

Christopher T. BEGG

David L. PETERSEN, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 - a Commentary* (The Old Testament Library). 320 p. London-Philadelphia 1984. S.C.M. Press - The Westminster Press. \$ 24.95.

I commentari sui due primi libri profetici postesilici non sono frequenti. Per questo il lavoro del Petersen riempie veramente una lacuna. Tanto più che la bibliografia appare completa ed aggiornata. L'ordine del volume è quello che ci attendiamo per un commentario: una traduzione del testo, le note testuali che la giustificano ed infine il commentario esegetico vero e proprio.

Alcune osservazioni di dettaglio.

Pp. 25 s.: Per Zorobabele l'autore accetta la resa di *pēhah* con «governatore» ed ammette la possibilità che la Giudea fosse un distretto separato da Samaria e che portava il nome *yhūd*. Ma si tratta di *quaestio disputata* (a vexing question). Né i sigilli pubblicati da N. Avigad nel 1976 (*Qédem* IV) costituiscono una prova al riguardo: troppo dubbia e controversa è l'interpre-

tazione del reperto fino ad oggi. Cfr. per il problema la mia *Storia d'Israele* (Brescia 1984), 403 (trad. ingl. [London-Philadelphia 1984] 271).

Pp. 70 ss. Sul quesito di Ag 2,10-14 l'autore apporta praticamente tutto il materiale disponibile per una spiegazione o un'illustrazione. La domanda, come l'autore vede giustamente, si riduce in fondo a questo: perché l'impurità contamina sempre, mentre la purezza quasi mai? Il quesito viene riproposto in termini differenti nella seconda metà di Gen 18: perché l'empietà travolge, mentre la giustizia salva solo raramente? Le due questioni vanno viste nel dibattito su delitto, colpa, responsabilità e castigo che seguì l'esilio di Babilonia.

P. 92: Ag 2,17 s'ispira evidentemente ad Am 4,9, che l'autore considera chiaramente più antico del primo testo. Ma se il testo di Amos appartenesse invece a quella redazione dtr. del libro, messa in evidenza da W. H. Schmidt nel 1965 e da J. Vermeylen nel 1978?

Pp. 214 ss.: Particolarmente interessante appare la ricostruzione della scena descritta in Zac 4,1-6a.10b-14.

Pp. 272 ss.: In Zac 6,9-15 la questione delle due corone viene presentata, se vedo bene, nel senso che il destinatario della seconda è il davidide Zorobabele.

Un ottimo libro dunque, anche per le due monumentali e fondamentali introduzioni ai due libri.

Via Pietro Cossa, 42
00193 Roma

J. A. SOGGIN

W. G. E. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry. A Guide to its Techniques*. 455 p. Sheffield 1984. JSOT Press.

He aquí un libro que por la riqueza, el orden, la claridad, puedo recomendar calurosamente. Se presenta como un manual: de trabajo para el especialista, de aprendizaje para el estudiante. Además de recoger resultados ajenos e informar sobre teorías, el autor aporta mucho material personal.

Coloca la poética bíblica en el marco de la literatura semítica antigua, académica y ugarítica. Y en el marco imprescindible de la ciencia literaria moderna, especialmente de habla inglesa.

Después de exponer su tarea y método y de describir el estilo oral de la poesía hebrea, va pasando revista a los diversos estilemas o recursos de estilo poético. Los capítulos, con abundantes divisiones y subdivisiones, son: metro, paralelismo, estrofa, tipos de verso, sonoridad, imágenes, otros recursos poéticos, técnicas secundarias. Siguen algunos análisis o aplicaciones a poemas individuales y una serie copiosa de índices.

Dada la importancia y oportunidad de la obra y el amplio público al que está merecidamente dirigida, quiero proponer algunos puntos de discusión que permitan mejorar la obra en futuras ediciones (que deseo y espero que llegarán).

I. Recursos de estilo. El índice inicial y el índice temático, con más de mil ochocientos datos, muestran la riqueza de fenómenos observados, catalogados y descritos. Aun así, siempre faltarán unos cuantos. Yo echo de menos especialmente los siguientes.

1. Sobre el metro: el silencio como factor constitutivo, en forma de cesura o pausa; la relación de metro y ritmo o esquema y realización, como clave de un análisis estilístico.

2. Antítesis. Dada la importancia de este recurso en sus formas variadas, creo que no basta mencionarlo de paso a propósito de otros estilemas o como simple función. La antítesis es frecuentísima en la literatura profética y es constitutiva de gran parte de la literatura sapiencial.

3. Entre los estilemas de relación semántica o de significado se encuentra la correlación. Entiendo por correlativos binas como «fuego/combustible, miseria/misericordia». «Luz/tinieblas» más que correlativos empareja antónimos o contrarios; tampoco parecen ser correlativos «ciego/tullido».

4. En la sonoridad habría que mencionar el sonido clave (Keysound, Leitklang). Y lamento que no haya recogido la metáfora sonora que se basa en la transferencia sensorial y consiste en describir con efectos sonoros movimientos o acciones. A propósito de la paronomasia de nombres propios hay que incluir A. Strus, *Nomen Omen* (Roma 1978).

5. Imágenes. Falta la alegoría, que no coincide con la metáfora o comparación prolongadas. En la bibliografía general falta la importante obra de P. Ricoeur, *La métaphore vive* (Paris 1975). El emblema podría entrar al menos como adjetivo, en los casos de animales emblemáticos: sea títulos honoríficos, emblemas poéticos (Gn 49) o como base de desarrollos amplios (naciones paganas en Ez).

Podría entrar en este apartado la caracterización o descripción abreviada, de la que es maestro Isaías. Una variedad es la etopeya, que encontramos en libros sapienciales (Prv y Eclo) y en imitaciones proféticas. Quizá piense el autor que emblema y etopeya sean géneros literarios más que recursos poéticos; otro tanto valdría para el enigma o acertijo.

6. A la personificación dedica el autor once líneas. Un recurso tan importante en la poesía hebrea, tan injustamente desatendido, se merece algo más. Baste recordar los poemas en que es protagonista *hokma*. El recurso está presente también en los salmos y en textos proféticos.

7. En el capítulo de la repetición habría que mencionar la recapitulación (Summationschema), que consiste en reunir al final varias palabras importantes del poema. Esta sección tendrá que tener en cuenta una tesis defendida por E. Zurro (nov. 1985) sobre «Procedimientos iterativos en la poesía hebrea y ugarítica».

8. La enumeración puede encajar en el capítulo de series o coincidir con ellas; pero no me gusta el término «lista». La enumeración o recorrido de miembros del cuerpo amado, con su correspondiente serie de comparaciones

exquisitas (Ct 5 y 7), nunca la llamaría lista. Hablando de series es importante el factor numérico para estilizar series o enumeraciones: p.e. la triple invocación, las series de siete o de diez. No coincide con el artificio numérico de $n+1$.

9. Composición y desarrollo. La retórica clásica distinguía tres actividades del arte que llamaba *inventio*, *dispositio* y *elocutio*. El autor se ha concentrado en la tercera, con ocasionales incursiones en la segunda. Aunque en pg 273 habla de «recursos estructurantes». En vez de composición, se podría llamar estructura (sin meterse en estructuralismo). Es un capítulo importantísimo de la poética, que debería describir tipos y recursos.

Sobre otros recursos y sobre otros ejemplos me atrevo a remitir al autor y al lector a nuestros comentarios *Profetas* (Madrid 1980) y *Job* (Madrid 1983). Si no me equivoco, son los únicos comentarios que ofrecen un «Índice de temas literarios», en el cual entran también diversos recursos poéticos. Y en el volumen *Proverbios* (Madrid 1984) remito al estudio comparativo formal de pgs 117-150.

II. Clasificación. Distingo división y ordenación.

1. División. Es lógico que algunos recursos poéticos exijan subdivisión en tipos o variedades, a los que pueden corresponder nombres técnicos y fórmulas esquemáticas. Ahora bien, existe siempre el peligro de multiplicar demasiado las subdivisiones, y el autor es consciente del peligro (pg 384 «perhaps taxonomy has been overstressed»). Cuando analizamos los sonidos de una lengua, nos concentramos en los fonemas, distinguidos por su función diacrítica; y descuidamos variantes fonéticas y factores «suprasegmentales». Quizá algo semejante, aunque con menos rigor, se pudiera aplicar a los recursos de estilo. El quiasmo es distinto de la disposición paralela, sus fórmulas son: *ab/ba* y *ab/ab*. ¿Es relevante que afecte a dos o tres miembros? ¿Hay que distinguirlos con nombres propios? Quizá sea más práctico operar con un sistema de fórmulas con letras, como instrumento para el análisis individual. Pues bien, me parece que el autor, influido por minuciosos trabajos precedentes en un par de áreas, se ha excedido en las subdivisiones. Me refiero a los capítulos sobre paralelismo, estrofa, tipos de versos. Lo que hace en pg 151, renunciando a seguir adelante clasificando, se podía haber aplicado en otras zonas, recurriendo a notas. Habría ahorrado espacio para tratar otros estilemas.

Se añade el deseo de etiquetar cada fenómeno y cada variante: *mirror*, *complete*, *split-member*, *partial chiastic*, *terrace*, *staircase*, *chiastic-terrace*, *pivot*. Y hablando de nombres, donde ya existe una terminología tradicional, prefiero atenerme a ella: p.e. *climático* en vez de *staircase*, concatenación en vez de *terrace* (*ab.bc.cd...*), inclusión en vez de *envelope*.

También hay que notar que algunos fenómenos o casos concretos admiten diversas interpretaciones: *merismo* o caracterización, adición en A o *elipsis* en B. El autor es consciente de ello.

2. Ordenación o clasificación de conjunto. Toda clasificación en estas materias es convencional y relativa, pues depende de los parámetros escogidos. Los antiguos distinguían *tropos* y *figuras*, *figuras de pensamiento* y de *dicción*. He indicado la clasificación mayor del autor, según el índice inicial.

Ha dedicado mucho espacio a temas bastante estudiados, pgs 87-220; algo menos a temas medianamente o poco estudiados, pgs 222-272; en menos de 90 páginas presenta el resto. Me voy a referir al capítulo 11. Encuentro particularmente acertada la organización, con correspondiente cuadro sinóptico, de los estilemas que caen bajo la repetición. Sobre el resto me permito algunas observaciones.

Encabalgamiento (enjambement) y contrapeso (ballast) creo que pertenecen al capítulo del metro o del verso; el estribillo (refrain) creo que pertenece a la estrofa (o stanza). En un grupo de figuras (skhemata de los griegos) se pueden juntar cómodamente: la sinédoque (abstracto por concreto y viceversa), el merismo (parte o partes por el todo); la ironía con sus variantes (falta el sarcasmo); la pregunta retórica; la hipérbole y su opuesto la litotes (¿se da en la poesía hebrea?); el oxímoron y la sustentación (delayed identification).

3. Ordenación de apartados. De ordinario sigue el orden siguiente: descripción genérica del fenómeno, tipos o variantes, ejemplos académicos y ugaríticos, ejemplos hebreos, funciones, bibliografía genérica y específica. Es un orden excelente, que se aplica con la flexibilidad requerida en cada caso.

III. Con ello paso al valor pedagógico de la obra, que es sobresaliente. A ello contribuyen: la claridad en describir el fenómeno y la diligencia en distinguir sus tipos; el ofrecer material para el estudio; la bibliografía repartida por capítulos y secciones. Es un acierto citar textos en hebreo o transliterados con las correspondientes traducciones: facilita la consulta y el manejo. En una obra de este género son muy valiosos los índices, y el autor ha sido generoso en ofrecerlos (y paciente en compilarlos). Índice de temas o fenómenos estudiados (368-408), textos bíblicos (409-431) palabras hebreas (431-435), binas hebreas (435-436); textos, palabras y binas ugaríticas (441-443), textos y palabras académicas y otros textos (443-446), autores citados (447-455). 70 páginas en total.

El libro está destinado a imponerse, en gran parte por su valor pedagógico. Para su uso propongo un par de recomendaciones. El alumno deberá familiarizarse con los diversos recursos, distinguiendo tipos y funciones; después podrá ejercitarse en los textos sugeridos, pasando de la constatación a la función. Será muy útil contrastar recursos emparentados por algún aspecto. En otras palabras, el libro será para el estudiante un manual de ejercicios. Para el profesor el libro ha de ser sobre todo *organon* o instrumental para el análisis. Es decir, el especialista no debe contentarse con constatar, con rebuscar casos, como un botánico o un entomólogo; lo importante es analizar textos aquilatando la función de los recursos en la unidad poética.

En el capítulo 4 queda por aclarar una cuestión importante. Se debe distinguir mejor entre composición oral y recitación oral. No es lo mismo composición oral (o mental, sin escribir) que improvisación. Un poeta puede componer mentalmente, sin papel, un soneto artificioso; dudo que pueda improvisarlo. Me parece inaceptable decir que los profetas eran maestros de improvisación poética (pg 77). Mis estudios me llevan a la conclusión opuesta. Eso sí, componían escuchando y para la recitación oral. Y esto influye en su estilo.

Me queda una última alabanza para terminar. Tenemos que agradecer a la editorial la excelente, impecable impresión de un libro no tan fácil. Esta calidad excepcional me infunde un cierto temor: que los editores se resistan a introducir cambios y mejoras en el libro. Pero si el libro se puede mejorar, significa que es bueno.

Pontificio Instituto Bíblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Luis ALONSO SCHÖKEL

Novum Testamentum

Anton DAUER, *Johannes und Lukas*. Untersuchungen zu den johanneisch-lukanischen Paralleelperikopen Joh 4,46-54/Lk 7,1-10 – Joh 12,1-8/Lk 7,36-50; 10,38-42 – Joh 20,19-29/Lk 24,36-49 (Forschung zur Bibel, Band 50). 505 p. 22,5 × 15. Würzburg 1984. Echter Verlag.

Dans une matière si complexe où pullulent depuis quelques années les contributions parfois les plus divergentes, la première qualité de cette étude est sa clarté. Introduction et conclusion mettent clairement en relief le projet de l'A. déjà connu dans l'exégèse néotestamentaire pour son ouvrage: *Die Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium* (StANT 30; München 1972). Il s'agit d'ailleurs de renouer avec l'argument alors soutenu (pp. 35-36). L'état de la recherche fait apparaître un clivage entre les tenants d'une dépendance directe de Jean par rapport aux Synoptiques — ou vice-versa — et ceux qui soutiennent plutôt une indépendance de la tradition johannique. Pour Dauer, la solution se trouve dans une voie médiane: il y a un lien, vraisemblablement de dépendance, de Jn par rapport à Lc en l'occurrence, pour les textes étudiés à titre de sondage révélateur, mais il n'est ni direct ni seulement écrit. L'étude approfondie du texte johannique permettrait de déceler une tradition antérieure à la rédaction définitive (*vor-joh*), qui a dû subir une influence de Lc mais de telle sorte qu'elle a connu une refonte, à la fois orale et écrite à ce stade de la genèse du texte, avant d'être intégrée par l'évangéliste proprement dit.

Après le dédale d'analyses minutieuses, la conclusion reprend ces déterminations, appliquées aux péripécies en question: la guérison du fils du centurion, l'onction à Béthanie et l'apparition du Christ ressuscité aux disciples. On ne saurait mieux faire que de la citer dans sa concision. « Dans les péripécies étudiées, au degré de la tradition préjohannique (*vor-joh*), a lieu une influence mutuelle des différentes transmissions (*Überlieferungen*) (y compris celles des Synoptiques existantes pour nous), ou une transformation (*Umgestaltung*) et un support (*Ausgestaltung*) des récits synoptiques.

a) La mouture préjohannique de Jn 4,46-54 est une libre reproduction de Mt 8,5-13 sous un emploi des récits de Lc 7,1-10, où le récit synoptique est stylisé en une pure histoire de miracle, du fait que l'intérêt du (des) narrateur(s) se porte seulement sur le miracle de Jésus.

b) Dans la strate préliminaire (*Vorlage*) à Jn 12,1-8, Mc 14,3-9 par Mt et Lc 7,36-38(-50) (et Lc 10,38-42?) sont coulés ensemble. Cela peut être apparu au cours de la tradition orale. C'est dire que le récit de Béthanie, littérairement fixé, de Mc 14,3-9 a été de nouveau raconté oralement, et à ce stade, en partie il a été nouvellement formulé et de nouveaux noms ont été introduits, mais en partie aussi la teneur marcienne a été conservée. Au cours de ce processus de tradition, plutôt inconsciemment que consciemment, des détails ont été pris à la péricope rédigée de Luc sur la pécheresse (et Lc 10,38-42). En d'autres termes: les ressemblances entre Jn 12,1-8 et Lc 7,36-38(-50) (et Lc 10,38-42) proviennent du fait que ces derniers versets qui se sont développés à partir de Mc 14,3-9, ont influencé, au cours de la tradition (orale) l'histoire préjohannique.

c) Les parallèles entre Jn 20,19-23(-29) et Lc 24,36-49 sont finalement à expliquer de telle manière que le récit lucanien se trouve au commencement du développement de la tradition préjohannique. Cette péricope lucanienne, dans la transmission ultérieure — préjohannique —, a été alors abrégée, formée et complétée par de nouveaux matériaux (pp. 297-298).

Pour arriver à des résultats si nuancés, l'A. déploie une érudition et une rigueur d'analyse peu communes qui forcent l'admiration, même si tout ne ravit pas également l'adhésion. La *Traditionsgeschichte* et la *Redaktionsgeschichte* trouvent ainsi, dans le champ des études johanniques, une application et une illustration à nos yeux éblouissantes. Les analyses procèdent pas à pas, pédagogiquement, avec modestie et probité intellectuelle. Le lecteur se sent accompagné et les doutes comme les points d'interrogation ne sont pas éludés. Une mine de renseignements est ouverte au passage et une véritable somme d'informations est fournie au point que c'est une joie d'en apprendre autant en si peu d'espace.

Il n'est pas possible ici d'entrer dans le détail des démonstrations pour les avaliser ou les critiquer. Bornons-nous à quelques remarques, à la fois de forme et de fond, d'abord au sujet du chapitre 3 qui nous a le plus intéressé. La progression est appréciable dans la manière de procéder systématiquement à des rapports de ressemblances et de différences entre les textes considérés, en passant du point de vue linguistique à celui du contenu. Aucune difficulté textuelle n'est négligée et l'objectivité est reine en ce domaine. C'est au moment de déterminer la *Vorlage* de Jn 20,19-29 (mais l'on peut en dire autant pour les autres passages étudiés) que les questions commencent à s'accumuler. On est surpris, par exemple, de voir si facilement la précision de temps («le soir de ce jour un de la semaine») versée au compte de la tradition préjohannique (p. 219). D'une part, on ne voit pas qu'elle vienne ailleurs ou d'ailleurs que du texte johannique définitif — donc de l'évangéliste, dans l'hypothèse de Dauer —, d'autre part, comme si souvent dans la littérature exégétique, cette précision ne fait l'objet d'aucun approfondissement au niveau du sens. On ne peut que le regretter. Des réflexions du même genre au sujet du rapport entre Jn 20 et «les discours d'adieu» conduisent à l'établissement de

la distinction entre tradition et rédaction (p. 222). Elles manifestent les limites d'une approche trop unilatéralement diachronique des textes. L'évolution de leur position dans ce domaine chez des auteurs comme R. Schnackenburg à qui le volume est dédié pour son soixante-dixième anniversaire (et auquel est associé J. Reuss pour ses quatre-vingts ans) révèle tout le flottement auquel on assiste (p. 227; cf. note 193, p. 428). C'est à propos du coup de lance en 19,34 mis au compte tantôt de la tradition, tantôt de l'évangéliste. Les critères pour détecter pareille appartenance ne sont effectivement pas nets. Pourquoi un texte de l'Écriture ferait-il tout de go partie de la tradition (pp. 228-229)? On s'étonne aussi, à un plan plus interprétatif, de voir contestée la typologie de l'agneau pascal au moment où les citations de l'A. T. pointent précisément vers lui (Ex 12,46; cf. p. 230). Un des mérites de l'étude est cependant de ne pas trop forcer les choses et de signaler honnêtement les dilemmes ou les franges d'indécision. C'est ce qui la rend attachante du point de vue de la recherche, par contraste avec tant de pouvoir d'affirmation non vérifiée et non vérifiable chez beaucoup d'autres.

Le modèle proposé par Dauer est assez souple et nuancé pour permettre un certain jeu. Il reste que même là on se heurte parfois à des hypothèses difficilement contrôlables. Certaines lignes d'interprétation sont convaincantes. Au sujet du premier épisode étudié, la guérison du fils du centurion, il semble fondé d'y lire une insistance sur la foi des païens. Fallait-il pourtant ce formidable détour pour arriver à justifier pareille lecture? En ce qui concerne l'onction à Béthanie et l'apparition aux disciples, la méthode ne condamne-t-elle pas l'accès à l'univers de représentations propre aux évangiles dans leur texture définitive? Comme si souvent pour Mc, le rapport de l'onction à l'eucharistie, attesté lexicalement par les mentions du corps et les verbes sémantiquement proches «répandre» et «verser», risque par une tel traitement de rester à jamais enfoui. A propos de la même scène, chez Jn, le lien avec Jn 11 se trouve par là même totalement occulté, alors qu'il est question de Marie dès 11,2 et de la résurrection de Lazare en 12,9. Mais c'est surtout à propos de Jn 20 que le recours exclusif à la tradition et à la rédaction ne permet guère d'entrer dans une lecture globale, inductrice d'une expérience spirituelle dont on ne peut quand même pas nier qu'elle soit voulue par le texte et son auteur. Que les accents différents au sujet de l'Esprit entre le Discours de la Cène et le récit de la résurrection puissent relever de la genèse diachronique du texte, c'est ce qu'il est permis de penser à ce niveau de considérations. Ce n'est pas le seul. Il doit être subordonné, méthodologiquement parlant selon l'aveu de gens comme Schnackenburg lui-même dans son commentaire de Jn, à une perspective synchronique qui valorise tout autrement les mêmes différences. Le regard sur le texte change considérablement à partir du moment où celui-ci est perçu dans son unité organique définitive, tout en respectant les acquis — certains acquis, car ils ne sont pas légion! — de la diachronie. C'est ce que nous avons cherché bien imparfaitement à faire à propos de Jn 13-17, dans *La gloire d'aimer* (AnBib 90; Rome 1981), et c'est dans ce sens, vraiment fécond, que s'orientent aussi maintenant des auteurs comme Culpepper, sensibles à la «narratologie», par delà les excès structuralistes. Du Discours à la résurrection, un seuil est franchi: il n'est autre que la mort sur la croix, lieu de la «livraison» de l'Esprit. Rien n'est

dit en ce sens au sujet de l'emploi en Jn 20,22 d'un verbe de création («Il souffla sur eux»), même si les réminiscences bibliques sont bien mentionnées (p. 237). Le fait qu'autorité sur le péché soit donnée à ce moment (20,23), quand bien même cette terminologie semble peu présente dans le reste de l'évangile, et pour cette raison même, n'est-il pas en soi significatif? Ne rejoint-il pas ce que le croyant lui-même peut éprouver en Église par son entrée sensible dans le mystère pascal du Christ?

Au plan proprement diachronique, d'aucuns reprocheront à Dauer de ne pas suffisamment étayer son modèle. En particulier, pour le chapitre 1, le renvoi à la source Q laisse entier le problème de savoir quels sont les contours de cette source et son rapport à la genèse des Synoptiques. Nous ne lui en ferons pas grief. Si nous avons à choisir une théorie génétique, c'est à une hypothèse de ce genre que nous nous rallierions, avec ses indéterminations et ses points d'interrogation. Tout n'est pas expliqué par là: tout le sera-t-il jamais? Mais ce n'est pas l'essentiel. Nous avons suggéré où cet essentiel se trouve. Une œuvre magistrale comme celle-ci le fait encore mieux apparaître.

60, rue du Collège Saint-Michel
B-1150 Bruxelles

Yves SIMOENS, S.J.

Raymond E. BROWN, *The Epistles of John*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (The Anchor Bible 30). 812 p. Garden City, N.Y. 1982. Doubleday & Company.

Avec ce commentaire monumental, le P. Brown apporte une conclusion à ses travaux sur les écrits johanniques, travaux dont les étapes principales furent son commentaire sur le quatrième évangile (1966 et 1970) puis son étude sur «la communauté du disciple bien-aimé» (1979, traduction française 1983). Dans la Préface de ce dernier volume, l'auteur annonçait son intention d'y synthétiser sa vision du christianisme johannique (p. 7 de l'éd. française). A cette synthèse, on peut dire que le commentaire des Épîtres devait apporter une confirmation exégétique.

Rappelons brièvement l'idée que l'auteur se fait de l'histoire mouvementée de la communauté johannique. A l'origine, des Juifs, dont des disciples du Baptiste et le futur «disciple bien-aimé», «qui avait connu Jésus durant son ministère» (op. cit., p. 182), confessant Jésus comme Messie davidique («basse christologie»). En second lieu, des Juifs opposés au Temple et des Samaritains convertis préconisant une christologie de type mosaïque insistant sur la préexistence de Jésus et provoquant l'exclusion des chrétiens johanniques de la synagogue pour abandon du monothéisme. En troisième lieu, des «Grecs» provoquant un élargissement universaliste de la pensée johannique sur la base de la «haute christologie» de la préexistence d'où un conflit avec les judéo-johanniques et une rupture au sein de la communauté, tandis que des relations étaient maintenues avec les «chrétiens apostoliques». Ces boule-

versements successifs auraient orienté les partisans de l'auteur des Épîtres vers la «grande Église» et une structure ecclésiale «officiellement mandatée pour enseigner», tandis que les dissidents se rapprochaient du gnosticisme et du montanisme.

A cette reconstruction audacieuse, peut-on dire que le Commentaire des Épîtres apporte une confirmation? Nous en doutons quelque peu. Seule nous paraît définitivement confirmée l'hypothèse d'une communauté johannique habitée de conflits allant jusqu'au schisme, conflits touchant la personne de Jésus comprise comme un être «spirituel» par les uns et «charnel» par les autres. Ne suffit-il pas, pour expliquer ce conflit, d'ailleurs déjà perceptible dans le quatrième évangile, de penser à la pression de l'hellénisme ambiant et à l'idéologie spiritualisante des «hommes divins»?

Après une longue préface (pp. 3 à 146), où l'auteur reprend les thèses de son ouvrage de 1979, le commentaire de chaque péricope, selon le schéma habituel de l'*Anchor Bible*, comprend deux parties distinctes: une analyse très détaillée et remarquablement informée de chaque verset puis le commentaire proprement dit qui en reprend les grandes lignes. Pour chaque péricope, une bibliographie spéciale suit le commentaire.

C'est évidemment dans l'analyse des principaux concepts, réputés «johanniques» que réside l'intérêt principal de l'ouvrage. La tendance constante de l'auteur est de les expliquer en les rapprochant de leurs correspondants dans le quatrième évangile, ou même dans d'autres livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament. Ceci n'est pas sans inconvénient car la terminologie des Épîtres est revêtue d'une spécificité que seul le contexte immédiat fait apparaître. En voici quelques exemples:

Au sujet des dissidents combattus par l'auteur des Épîtres, le P. Brown pense qu'ils professaient une christologie «exagérant» (sic, *passim*) la «haute christologie» de la préexistence et qu'ainsi ils déniaient au Jésus terrestre toute importance pour le salut. Mais la première et la deuxième épître font plutôt allusion, chez les dissidents, à un Jésus terrestre *et* spirituel, donc très important dans sa destinée ici-bas comme révélateur du Père, comme c'était le cas pour tous les hommes divins tardivement idéalisés et spiritualisés. C'est bien leur épiphanie terrestre qui est décisive pour le salut. Si tel n'était pas le cas, on ne comprendrait pas l'attachement des dissidents pour le récit de la vie de Jésus dans le quatrième évangile, attachement que les Épîtres présupposent constamment.

L'auteur pense que le «commencement» auquel les Épîtres se réfèrent six fois est le commencement de l'auto-révélation de Jésus aux disciples historiques, révélation recueillie plus tard par le disciple bien-aimé. Mais si les Épîtres s'autorisaient d'un témoin direct de la vie de Jésus, ne le feraient-elles pas plus clairement au lieu d'user de formules remarquablement vagues sur «ce qui était dès le commencement» ou «ce que vous avez entendu dès le commencement»? Certes, il s'agit bien de Jésus dans cet enseignement original, mais d'un Jésus déjà interprété par la tradition johannique; le rôle privilégié du «bien-aimé» dans cette interprétation ne saurait être qu'une hypothèse, nous semble-t-il.

L'auteur (p. 168 et *passim*) donne constamment aux cinq verbes qui se rattachent à l'idée d'«annonce» la valeur générale de bonne nouvelle: «the

public and beneficial character of the Christian message». Mais le contexte immédiat recommande plutôt la valeur plus précise et polémique d'annonce-notification-prescription. Cette nuance est importante car il y va du genre littéraire des Épîtres; elles s'adressent à des chrétiens menacés par la propagande des dissidents et leur «prescrivent» de demeurer fidèles à l'enseignement qu'ils ont reçu à l'origine de leur vie chrétienne, c'est à dire johannique.

Au sujet de la connaissance de Dieu à laquelle prétendent les dissidents, les Épîtres posent la question capitale: comment peut-on être sûr de la posséder? Dans 1 Jn 2,3 par ex. (litt. «... nous connaissons que nous avons connu»), le commentaire fait intervenir l'idée vétérotestamentaire d'une connaissance eschatologique directe et immédiate caractéristique de l'alliance nouvelle et du cœur nouveau (Jer 31; Ez 36 etc.) au sens d'une connaissance «intérieure» et «intime», indépendante de tout enseignement humain. Mais alors, comment expliquer, dans les Épîtres et même chez les dissidents la référence constante à la tradition humaine de l'enseignement johannique? Si les destinataires de 1 Jn, en 2,27, n'ont «plus besoin qu'on les enseigne», ce n'est pas que l'Esprit, dans l'onction, leur enseigne tout directement, c'est que la catéchèse qu'ils ont déjà reçue «au commencement» n'a pas besoin d'être complétée. Ce qui authentifie la connaissance, selon 1 Jn, ce n'est pas l'expérience de l'onction, c'est que «nous gardons ses commandements» (2,3). La prétention à une connaissance directe et purement spirituelle de Dieu sera le fait des dissidents puis des gnostiques.

Au sujet de l'autorité doctrinale dans la communauté johannique, particulièrement selon 1 Jn 4,1-6 (p. 507ss. du commentaire), l'auteur réfute d'abord le commentaire de Bonsirven (nécessité d'un magistère infaillible dans l'Eglise), puis celle de Dodd (recours à l'autorité de l'Eglise dans son ensemble, «as a whole»); ces deux réfutations nous paraissent acquises. Brown relève l'autorité sans cesse soulignée de la confession christologique, à juste titre. Il n'en reste pas moins que cette confession est rappelée par un «presbytre», qui la représente dans la communauté (v. 6).

Ces quelques remarques ont pour but de souligner l'indéniable valeur de ce commentaire imposant.

Avenue Davel, 7
1007 Lausanne
Suisse

Pierre BONNARD

Seyoon KIM, *The "Son of Man" as the Son of God* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 30 [Hrsg. Martin Hengel und Otfried Hofius]). x-118 p. Tübingen 1983. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 48,- DM.

Dieses Buch ist dünner als viele Untersuchungen zum Menschensohn-Titel Jesu und dennoch dürfte es sich als gewichtiger erweisen als mancher

bisherige Entwurf. Der junge südkoreanische Exeget Seyoon Kim hat sich bereits mit seiner weithin beachteten Arbeit *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (WUNT II/4; Tübingen 1981), die vor kurzem (1984) in zweiter Auflage erschien, zu Wort gemeldet. Das vorliegende Buch war ursprünglich als eine umfassende Erörterung der Menschensohn-Problematik geplant. Aber da sich die Arbeit an diesem größeren Werk verzögerte, entschloß sich Kim, eine Synthese seiner Forschungen vorab zu veröffentlichen. Das ist in seinem Fall sehr zu begrüßen, denn obwohl naturgemäß viele Fragen aufgeschoben werden mußten, wird schon jetzt ein wohlbegründetes Gesamtbild sichtbar. Der Verfasser gibt an vielen Stellen selbst zu erkennen, wieviel er den Anregungen der Tübinger Neutestamentler Otto Betz, Martin Hengel und Peter Stuhlmacher verdankt, dennoch handelt es sich um einen wirklich originellen Beitrag zu einem der meist verhandelten Themen der heutigen Exegese.

Kim setzt mit der unbezweifelbaren Tatsache ein, daß auf der Ebene der Endredaktion alle vier Evangelien den Menschensohn mit dem Sohn Gottes identifizieren (S. 1-6). Aber ist das lediglich das Endprodukt einer langen christologischen Entwicklung? Kim bestreitet das mit guten Gründen. In Auseinandersetzung mit der weit verbreiteten Position von H. E. Tödt (*Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Tradition* [Gütersloh 1978]) zeigt er, daß "Menschensohn" *Selbstbezeichnung* des irdischen Jesus war (S. 7-14). Doch vor welchem religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund ist diese Selbstprädikation zu verstehen? Da alle Ableitungen der Menschensohn-Vorstellung von außerisraelitischen Mythen überaus problematisch sind, versucht Kim eine alttestamentlich-innerjüdische Traditionsgeschichte aufzuzeigen (S. 15-37). Wie vor ihm schon besonders O. Procksch, A. Feuillet und M. Black deutet er den "Menschenähnlichen" (בְּנֵי אָדָם) von Dan 7,13 als Hypostasierung der "Herrlichkeit Gottes" (כְּבוֹד), die sich in der Thronvision Ezechiels als מְגִלָּת כְּבוֹדָא אֲדָם zeigt (Ez 1,26). Der "Menschenähnliche" ist also eine göttliche Gestalt, aber gleichzeitig nach Dan 7,18.22.27 Inkorporation der "Heiligen des Höchsten", das heißt des eschatologischen Gottesvolkes. In der von Ez 1 und Dan 7 ausgehenden Traditionsgeschichte stehen auch die Texte 1 Hen 37-41 und 4 Esr 13, die vermutlich nachneutestamentlich, höchstens aber gleichzeitig mit dem Neuen Testament sind (S. 19-20). Sie verstehen den Menschensohn als messianische Gestalt.

Doch gab es eine messianische Interpretation von Dan 7,13 auch schon in vorneutestamentlicher Zeit? Kims Urteil ist hier mit Recht vorsichtiger als die ältere Forschung. Aber gegenüber der Ansicht des Erstherausgebers J. A. Fitzmyer ("The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament", *NTS* 20 [1973/74] 382-407, 393) weist er auf einige bemerkenswerte Parallelen zwischen 4QpsDan A* (= 4Q246, nicht 4Q243 wie bei Kim) und Dan 7 hin (S. 20-22). Sie legen nahe, den dort genannten "Gottessohn" (Kol. 2.1: בְּנֵי יְיָ אֱלֹהִים) als messianische Gestalt zu interpretieren und mit dem "Menschensohn" gleichzusetzen. Wichtig für das Verständnis von Dan 7,13f im neutestamentlichen Zeitraum sind auch die Lesarten des Kölner Papyrus 967, des Kodex 88 und der Syro-Hexapla (S. 22-26). In deutlichem Gegenüber, aber auch in bewußter Anspielung auf den "Alten der Tage", also Gott (Dan 7,9), reden sie in Dan 7,13 von einem $\omega\varsigma$ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἤρχετο καὶ $\omega\varsigma$ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν (Pap. Cologne 967). Für diese Textlesarten ist der

“Menschenähnliche” ganz eindeutig ein göttliches Wesen, das man, weil andererseits von Gott selbst unterschieden, seinen “Sohn” nennen könnte. Der Titel erscheint allerdings nicht und es bildet eine gewisse Schwierigkeit für Kim, daß Menschensohn und Gottessohn außer an der späten Stelle MidrPs 2,9 (zu 2,7) nicht explizit nebeneinander erscheinen (S. 30). In die Nachgeschichte von Dan 7 gehört auch ein von Origenes (*Comm. in Ioann.* II 31 [25]) zitiertes Fragment aus einem jüdisch-apokryphen “Gebet des Joseph” (S. 26-31). Dort begegnet weiter die in der Merkabah-Mystik aufgrund von Gen 28,12 entwickelte Spekulation von der himmlischen Inkorporation Israels im Stammvater Jakob. Auch das Motiv vom Herabsteigen der Weisheit (vgl. Sir 24) klingt an.

Mit C. F. D. Moule nimmt Kim den durchgehenden Gebrauch des Artikels bei der Menschensohnbezeichnung Jesu (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου = בֶּר אָדָם) als Hinweis dafür, daß Jesus sich auf eine bestimmte Gestalt, nämlich den “Menschensohn” von Dan 7,13, bezog (S. 32-37). Hat er Dan 7,13 ähnlich verstanden, wie es in der skizzierten Traditionsgeschichte geschah? Kim bringt nicht nur neue Argumente für die Echtheit des Lösegeldwortes in Mk 10,45 (Mt 20,28) vor. Mit W. Grimm (*Die Verkündigung Jesu und Deutero-Jesaja* [ANTJ 1; Frankfurt 1981] 239-268) sieht er das Logion von der im Urchristentum kaum angeführten Stelle Jes 43,3f bestimmt. Darüberhinaus zeigt er aber die tiefe Verwurzelung in Jes 53 sowie die weitgehende Strukturverwandtschaft zu den Abendmahlsworten (S. 38-73). Hier bleiben die Ausführungen Kims selbst für den überzeugend, der nicht wie er das Lösegeldwort auch historisch in die Abendmahlssituation stellt. Jesus hat somit die eucharistischen Worte als der Menschensohn gesprochen, der seinen Weg in Erfüllung der deutero-jesajanischen Gottesknechtsweissagung geht. Mit dem Abendmahl jedoch kündigte er sein stellvertretendes Sühneleiden an, das einen “neuen Bund” und damit auch ein neues Gottesvolk konstituiert. *Der Menschensohn schafft also das eschatologische Gottesvolk.*

Von dieser Grundaussage her gelingt es Kim nun, Aspekte der synoptischen Überlieferung zu vereinen, die für viele Forscher auseinanderfallen und deshalb in wechselnder Auswahl Jesus immer wieder abgesprochen werden. Wenn er seinen Anhängern die eigene, intime Gottesanrede “Abba” erlaubte, so gibt hier der Sohn Gottes Anteil am endzeitlichen Gottesvolk. *Der Gottessohn macht als Menschensohn Menschen zu Gotteskindern* (S. 74-75). Die βασιλεία-Verkündigung zielte ebenso vor allem auf die Sammlung der eschatologischen Heils-gemeinde (S. 76-78). Besonders die Antwort Jesu beim Verhör vor dem Hohenpriester (Mk 14,62ff) zeigt, daß er selbst schon seinen Menschensohn-Anspruch nach 2 Sam 7,12-15 (vgl. 4QFlor 1,10-13) messianisch verstanden hat (S. 79-81). Eine interessante Verbindung von Gen 28,12 und 2 Sam 7,12ff entdeckt Kim in dem johanneischen (und vielleicht sogar jesuanischen) Menschensohn-Wort Joh 1,51 (S. 82-86). Auch die verschiedenen Typen von Menschensohn-Sprüchen lassen sich von Kims Grundthese her sinnvoll zueinander in Beziehung setzen (S. 87-94). Schließlich bleibt die Entstehung der nachösterlichen Verkündigung Jesu kein dunkles historisches Rätsel (S. 95-98).

Diese gedrängte Übersicht soll wenigstens einen Eindruck vom reichen Inhalt dieser Arbeit vermitteln. Nur Kleinigkeiten sind an ihrer äußeren

Form zu bemängeln. Die Untergliederungen der Kapitel III und IV, wie sie in der Inhaltsübersicht (S. IX-X) gegeben werden, erscheinen im Text selbst nicht. Im Verzeichnis der Sekundärliteratur (S. 104-108) hätte man bei den Artikeln nicht auf die Seitenzahlen verzichten müssen. Die beiden auf S. 105 unter dem Namen R. T. France angeführten Veröffentlichungen haben G. Friedrich zum Verfasser. Dafür fehlt das wichtige Buch *Jesus and the Old Testament* (London 1971) von France, das auf S. 62 Anm. 90 zitiert wird.

Alle, die es als unaufgebar ansehen, daß die kirchliche Christologie im Selbstanspruch Jesu verankert sein muß, werden Kims Werk begrüßen. Selbst in dieser zusammenfassenden Form beweist der Verfasser immer wieder, daß sich seine imponierende Synthese durch akribisch durchgeführte Einzelanalysen begründen läßt. So ist man zuversichtlich, daß Kims Konzeption die Auseinandersetzung mit anderen Entwürfen wie etwa dem von B. Lindars (*Jesus Son of Man. A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research* [London 1983]), den er nicht mehr berücksichtigen konnte, bestehen wird. Zu solchem Optimismus geben auch andere Veröffentlichungen aus jüngster Zeit Anlaß. So hat W. Horbury neue, bedenkenswerte Argumente für eine vorchristliche, messianische Deutung von Dan 7,13 ins Gespräch gebracht ("The Messianic Associations of 'the Son of Man'", *ITS* 36 [1985] 34-55). Noch weiter zurück geht W. Bittner ("Gott – Menschensohn – Davidsohn", *FZPhTh* 32 [1985] 343-372), der nachzuweisen versucht, daß die traditionsgeschichtlichen Bezüge von Dan 7 zur davidisch-messianischen Überlieferung so umfassend sind, daß eine messianische Interpretation nur noch das hervorhebt, was bereits Grundlage von Daniel 7 selbst ist. Bittner verweist besonders auf Psalm 8, wo Elemente aus der Schöpfung Adams (Gen 1,26.28) mit solchen der altorientalischen Königs-ideologie verwoben sind. Aber auch die Herrschaft, die der "Menschenähnliche" von Dan 7 über die Tiere ausübt, erinnert m.E. an Gen 1,28. Kim selbst erwähnt kurz, daß die Rabbinen Ez 1,26 f und Gen 1,25 f miteinander verbanden (S. 17). Könnte im Universalismus, den der Rückbezug von Dan 7 auf Gen 1 zu bedeuten scheint, ein zusätzliches Motiv gelegen haben, warum Jesus gerade "Menschensohn" als Selbstbezeichnung wählte? Man darf jedenfalls gespannt sein, wie Kim im angekündigten größeren Werk seinen verheißungsvollen Ansatz unter Aufnahme solcher neuen Vorschläge weiter durchführen wird.

Evang.-theol. Fakultät Tübingen
Schloßstr. 5
D-7409 Dusslingen

Rainer RIESNER

Varia

Alejandro Díez MACHO (ed.), *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*. Tomo I: Introducción general a los apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento (1984) 414 p.; Tomos II-IV: Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento (1983; 1982; 1984) 525 p.; 398 p.; 342 p. 24 × 15,5. Madrid 1982-1984. Ediciones Cristiandad.

These four books represent the General Introduction (Vol. I) and three of the projected five volumes of translations into Spanish of most of the pseud-epigraphic works emanating from the so-called "intertestamental period", somehow related to personages of either the Old Testament or the "intertestamental period" itself, and somewhat confusingly called "apocrypha" by the editors of the series. The contents of the series, therefore, are hard to predict from the title alone. Thus, the Qumran *Genesis Apocryphon* will find no place in the completed collection, nor will the works Roman Catholics call "Deuterocanonica" but which the rest of the world calls "Apocrypha"; yet all the major items usually called "Pseudepigraphs" (e.g., Jubilees, 4 Ezra, etc.) are all there.

The introductory volume was completed by A. Díez Macho before his death (6 October, 1984). It contains chapters on the nature, origin and theology of "los apócrifos", and a short description of each of the works whose translation will appear in the series. These descriptions are all of identical construction: (1) introductory notes; (2) theological content. There seems, however, to be a few discrepancies between the introductory volume's list of works and the list of translations which the editors have already published or intend to publish. The *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* (Vol. II, pp. 387 ff.) is not mentioned in Vol. I; and the *Vision of Esdras*, mentioned in Vol. I, does not seem to be part of the editors' plan for Vol. VI where it should have appeared.

Each of the translations (Vols. II-IV) comes equipped with an introduction (never very long) and a bibliography of its own. In the case of *I Enoch* (Vol. IV), the editors have also included translations of the important fragments (Aramaic and Coptic).

The principal reason why these translations are important is that, as indicated by all the bibliographies themselves, these are the *first* Spanish translations of these works ever to be published. Those contained in Volumes II-IV are the work of seventeen different scholars, working either separately or in tandem, and, like all such collections, the overall impression is bound to be uneven. Nevertheless, the project as a whole will doubtless remain a monument worthy of the one who conceived it, planned it, but passed away before seeing its completion — the late and sincerely lamented Alejandro Díez Macho.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Thomas FRANXMAN

Klaus BEYER, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten. 779 p. 24 × 16. Göttingen 1984. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

The title of so massive a book, in attempting to delineate its contents briefly, might well be expected to be somewhat deceptive, and it is. There is more than Dead Sea material among the texts, and there is a good deal more than just texts. The remarks which follow will treat the book's two principal divisions in reverse order, addressing themselves first to a brief account of the Aramaic texts confronting the reader.

The Aramaic texts from the Dead Sea are presented first (pp. 157-323), and the rest of the texts thereafter (pp. 324-406). Each item comes equipped with its own identifying cipher, yet this in itself is of little help in getting an accurate picture of what the author has put into his collection. The reviewer has taken the liberty of describing the character of the collection in terms of the three principal categories of Aramaic into which the texts, according to the author, fall.

"Hasmonean", a form of post-Achaemenian Imperial Aramaic, is the linguistic category into which the author places a lot of the material he has chosen to reprint. Here belong the texts from Qumran (with few exceptions), the documents from Wadi Murabba'at and Nahal Hever, three Hasmonean inscriptions, and, *reservatis reservandis*, a selection of brief private documents taken from *Mishnah* and *Tosephta*. It is clear that "Hasmonean" as a category allows the inclusion of items composed after, or even long after, Hasmonean times. The author would however relate this form of Aramaic also to the older level of Targum language (both Babylonian and Galilean) and to Babylonian "documentary" Aramaic. It is doubtless for this reason that one specimen of Galilean Targum (the Egyptian papyrus fragment dating from the fourth or fifth century A. D.) is also included.

A second linguistic category, *Altwestaramäisch*, has the distinction of including the Aramaic dialect spoken in Palestine at the time of Jesus of Nazareth. Examples of two species of *literary* language, however, are given us in the author's collection: *Altjudäisch*, as represented not only by inscriptions and fragments of parchment and papyrus, but also by *Megillath Taanith* (1st century A. D.) and by a small sampling of other Talmudic pieces; and *Altostjordanisch*, contained in the el-Mal (temple) inscription dated 7/6th century B.C. Akin to both of these, however, is the Aramaic of the oldest of the Henoch manuscripts (4QEn^a, or oH^a) — one of the few Qumran Aramaic documents not in the "Hasmonean" form.

Finally, there is a large selection of texts belonging to a third category, *Mittelwestaramäisch*, but representing five different dialects: three forms of *Mittelpalästinisch* (Galiläisch, Mitteljudäisch, Mittelostjordanisch), Samaritanisch, and Christlich-Palästinisch. There are some papyrus fragments among all this, but the bulk of the material is inscription. Since this form of Aramaic emerges only in the third Christian century, the material will date from then and the centuries following.

Such, in brief, is the scope of the collection. To this the author has appended both a grammar and a glossary. As it turns out, the grammar is indeed more than a mere grammatical index since, in addition to categorizing the peculiarities of spelling and accident attested within the considerable congeries of material presented, there is an impressive amount of other references provided. The glossary also is especially useful due to the present dearth of updated Aramaic lexica.

The book's other and first principal division, the introduction, describes the different varieties of dialect within the Aramaic sector of North-west Semitic, as well as the historical development of Aramaic as a whole. This introduction represents no small portion of the book (pp. 20-153), and both its parts treat of matters well enough known and, as far as such is usually thought possible, agreed upon. The description of dialects is heavily overloaded and the various stages of historical development are, though clearly indicated, mere pockets into which much linguistic information, qualification and debatable assumption are stuffed.

Bibliographical material is confined mostly to the footnotes and to the introductions to individual texts. The index is modest. Yet, as has been said, the collection of texts is made most useful by its accompanying grammar and glossary. The unreadable style of the introduction is regrettable and would have been redeemable but for one all too likely possibility. Living as we do in an age when electronic computers may place texts and the ability both to organize and to manipulate them at the disposal of the many, we may soon see the day when the principal advantage of this book is altogether outdated. Then the lack of a better introduction to his work on the part of so eminent an expert may indeed be both regrettable *and* irredeemable.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Thomas FRANXMAN

Michael E. STONE (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus (*Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section Two, Vol. II). XXIII-698 p. 24 x 16. Assen-Philadelphia 1984. Van Gorcum - Fortress Press.

Section One of the *Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* was completed in 1976. Section Two is to contain three volumes. The book under review is the second volume of that series, but the first to be published. It consists of fourteen articles produced by eleven contributors.

The opening article gives a general picture of the history of the Jews between the *diadochoi* and the Hadrianic rebellion, but the rest of the book is concerned with introducing the reader to the literature of that period.

Works usually lumped together as "apocrypha and pseudepigrapha" are dealt with in two articles (G. W. E. Nickelsburg) which manage to include, however, some items which are neither pseudepigraphic nor apocryphal. The *Sibylline Oracles*, Philo of Alexandria, Josephus and Qumran sectarian literature each has its own special chapter. What's left is dealt with categorically: history, wisdom, Jewish gnosticism, apocalyptic, testaments, sacred poetry, epistles.

The very nature of the book allows and perhaps necessitates some, not to say much, reduplication of material. The articles are, however, well written and done by authors knowledgeable and competent. What makes it slightly more than a good piece of *Einleitung* is the up-to-date character of the treatments and of the bibliography which accompanies them.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Thomas FRANXMAN

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Ebla Names and Gods at Rome Conference

This biblical periodical and others have often carried researches into the relevance of the third-millennium Ebla tablets for biblical exegesis, or chiefly for the background of Syrian history in the Ancient Near East framework. It may therefore be useful to report here the conference organized by the University of Rome, July 15-17, 1985, chiefly in order to bring together some of the cuneiform experts of the world to whom has been entrusted the publication of the tablets. On display were the five imposing volumes which have already appeared in the series ARET (Archivi Reali di Ebla, Testi, 1981-5) and others about to appear were previewed in papers by their authors. The entire discussion was focused on "The Onomasticon of Ebla: Semitic Name-Giving and Eblaic Prosopography", including however also toponymy, and largely concerned with the divinities whose names often form part of the one given to a Semite.

All the meetings were held in the Sala di Riunioni of the University Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia. The morning of July 15, after a welcome by the University authorities, the situation was outlined by Professor Paolo Matthiae, the excavator who after many years of work at Tell Mardîḥ near Aleppo discovered unexpectedly the thousands of tablets in what seems to be the oldest known Semitic language. He expressed warm gratitude to the Republic of Syria, whose earliest history has been so illumined by the discovery, and whose Ambassador was present; Matthiae also expressed confidence that an earlier polemic phase of the interpretation of the tablets had been surmounted.

Ignace J. Gelb of Chicago led off with the high points of a 140-page article making the point that the language of Ebla is identical with that of Mari. (He also still impenitently thinks that the correct spelling is Ibla, but has resigned himself to the universal usage.) He devoted a good while to the difficulty of deciding just what *is* a "name", as distinct from a common noun. There are 92 types of names, and of these only 6 are represented at Ebla (divine names, place names, months, etc.); we do not (yet!) have proper names of minor local features such as walls. We cannot take for granted that Ebla names are in the Ebla language. His main conclusion is that the grammar of names (Declension B) is *different* from the 'grammar (A) of texts': grammar B has no nominative suffix, but *-a* and *-u* suffixes (therefore primitively diptote as most Semitic languages) and no mimimation: traits which affect Old Akkadian and Amorite as well as Eblaite, whereas in 'grammar A of texts' Eblaite and Old Akkadian are akin, but Amorite is different. — In the discussion, Prof. Edzard said he cannot agree on this 'grammar of

names'; it sounds like the early Pettinato-days of Eblaite study. Chairman Sollberger said however that he would not only accept Gelb's position but would go beyond; Eblaite *is* Old-Akkadian!

Professor Joachim Krecher of Münster ("Observations on the Ebla toponyms") limited himself to the examination of cases in which the *writing* renders only approximately the *sound* (e.g. *hamadu* for *halmadu*): we find for the same word *šabirum*, *šabirium*, *šabiritum*. The scribe probably did not intend to fix by writing accidental changes due to the influence of adjacent sounds. It thus becomes a big problem whether we should equate or distinguish two similarly written place-names; sometimes we get help from the fact that the two recur in relation to the same persons. Of 1800 names, only about 10 begin with R. About 20 include a reduplication like *dada*. Some of the affixes of toponyms were found also with personal names. — In the discussion, Edzard said it seems we can conclude that toponyms resist Semitic interpretation more than personal names. Alfonso Archi of Rome, one of the chief organizers of the conference and of the ARET publications, interposed that most of the Syrian toponyms are published in ARET 3;4;1 (2 has personal names) but we still have to investigate the hamlets around Ebla; and he asked whether there are similar toponym-variants in Babylonian (answer: No). Picchioni objected to the use of -X for graphic variant; that means something else; on which Sollberger took occasion to interject that we should *not* so readily assume that the scribe did not write exactly what he meant.

Professor Paolo Fronzaroli of Florence gave the last paper of the morning, in French, "Typologies onomastiques à Ebla". Among interesting details we noted that the element *dadub* seems to be for *da'um* "connaissance"; *al* is written *hal* and *ma*₂ as *maḥ*; *a* alternates with *i*. It is rare that a name is written with variant divine-name affix (2 cases out of 120).

Professor Robert D. Biggs of Chicago, author of a recent illustrated Ebla survey in BA 43 (1980) 76-87, spoke on "Archaic Proper Names from Mesopotamia and the Proper Names from Ebla". Twenty years have passed since his article on Semitic names, and since then Abū Šalābīḥ has greatly added to the picture. Of 64 names there, those in *il* are commonest (17) and *ilum* (8); others are *il* + suffix; *aba*, *aḥa*; and verbal *iku* (for *ikun*). Ebla names are sufficiently different from Abū Šalābīḥ to suggest that they are a different ethnic group; but two *scribes'* names may be the same person in both places. In the discussion, Sollberger wondered whether the first element of *gibil-il* might mean "renew"; Edzard thought that *gar*₃ is a weakened short spelling of *wakal*; and Westenholz corrected the generalization that there are *no* Semitic names from Nippur.

Professor Olivier Rouault of Paris treated in French the intensely actual problem of computerization, "Le traitement informatisé des données onomastiques". We are now in a more promising phase of computer-use, but there are still big obstacles in its orientation primarily toward the exact sciences or business; there are also obstacles to our need of constantly introducing new elements into our programs. He proposed a new and more global strategy, including *all* words and not just names. He noted the importance of distinguishing a phase of *enregistrement* (feeding in) from a phase of *traitement*

(utilization, comparison). The ambiguity of many texts constitutes a problem for *enregistrement*, which can be solved by the use of parentheses. Archi raised the question, "How do you go from transcription to transliteration?" but the answer left us still a bit mystified. Sollberger: This is all too tidy, takes all the fun out of the work; Goetze used to say rightly, "The job of Assyriologists is to read texts, not to push buttons"; Rouault answered that he agreed entirely that you have to read the texts *before* you can push the buttons.

Professor Edmond Sollberger of London then gave his own paper, "The Structure of Ebla Personal Names, with Particular Reference to Theophorous Names; and an Attempt at 'Namengebung'", mostly from his forthcoming ARET 8. Theophorous names are easier to interpret than others. In 477 geographical and 953 personal names, we have some 30 names of gods, plus 20 in personal names, plus others in epithets or concepts. Gender of the verb-element does not accord with the sex of the god but of the bearer. Some predicates are found with only one or two divine names; some names have 1, 2, or 3 predicates. Malik is a common divine name, e.g. "the eye of Malik rejoiced". Lugal is title of the king of Mari, therefore not just a "junior official" in Eblaite as has been claimed. Among non-theophorous names, several refer to a second child born after death of the first: *e₂-da-ša* = *ḥadaša* "new"; also *aši-aḫu*, "I saw a brother" and *pūḫi* "a substitute has come". Others: "my white sheep" for an unruly child, carried into adulthood like "Babe" Ruth; *liqbi* "may he speak"; *salimu* "he is in good health"; *sū-nūri* "he is my light" (perhaps for a blind parent). In the discussion, Westenholz said that *a-aḫ* which had been noted is simply *aḫ* (answer: sometimes the divine name or a vocative is preceded by *a-*). Krecher asked if *ba!* could be for Ba'al (Yes). Cyrus Gordon pointed out that the strangely missing god Kura would be supplied in his paper from late magical texts. Gelb put forward as the million-dollar question, "Who is the god of Ebla? I haven't a clue. Ni-da-gul was proposed by Pettinato; Damu and Malik are commonest in names"; Gelb proposes *Dabi-ri-dingir-Ebla*. Pardee: Malik is never written with *dingir*-sign at Ebla. Edzard: the people whose names we know from Ebla are not all Eblaite, but a rather international collection; hence it is not clear that Damu and Malik are most frequent at Ebla itself.

Professor Dietz O. Edzard of München then gave his own paper in lucid German, "Semitische und nichtsemitische Personennamen in Ebla". He premised four warnings, chiefly that L disappears (*ba* for *bal* — for *ba'al*) and L-R interchange. We may assume that if the theophorous (or verbal) element is Semitic, then the other element also is. Not *all* names which we cannot explain are non-Semitic. Reduplications, *dada*, *nini* etc., are likely non-Semitic; also what Gelb called "banana-names" (second consonant equals third). *Mu-ut* may be *mutu* "man", therefore not non-Semitic. There are practically *no* Sumerian names (perhaps 2). Edzard at first thought some endings were Hurrian but he rejects that since some go with *yir'am*. *Ba-ḫa-ga* is the most notable case of a Semitic-looking name nowhere hinted in any Semitic dictionary. Conclusion: all in all, it is not likely that many Ebla names are non-Semitic. — In the discussion, Archi asked how you

explain that many *-ud* names are feminine (answer: perhaps Semitic *-ti*). Krecher noted that *igu* is perhaps itself a toponym rather than place-determinative; and he asked if there are any double-theophorous names (perhaps *iti-mut-il* confirmed at Terqa).

The paper by Aage Westenholz of Copenhagen was entitled "Religion at Ebla according to Personal Names; a Comparison with Mesopotamian Data". He recalled that at Ebla divine names are always in *third* person, *il-su* "his god", not *ili* "my god". Also, we never find in a name "slave" of the god; though we should note that in Sumerian the equivalent "dog of..." is "as common as fleas". Thirdly, *belum* is rare and there are *many* gods; whereas in pre-Sargonic Akkadian, only *Ilum* and *Ištar* are very common, and are *universal* deities, not place-bound (though *ilum* *can* mean "the city-god").

The paper prepared by Professor Giorgio Buccellati of Los Angeles, "Grammatical Categorization of the Proper Names of Ebla", was read for him in his absence; and Marcel Leibovici of Montréal was not able to present his paper on "Les Dieux d'Ebla au 3^e millénaire et les dieux d'Ugarit". Thus the papers given on the morning of July 16 as originally scheduled were by Professor Henri Limet of Liège on "Problèmes de graphie et phonologie", a number of random examples; and by Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo of Rome, "Problèmes d'interprétation de noms propres de Mari dans les textes d'Ebla", a paper which is to be published proximately.

Postponed to Tuesday afternoon with a change of title was the paper of Professor Manfred Krebernik of München, "Morphology of the [Prefix-conjugation] Verbal Element in Semitic Personal Names". He noted that there is no suffix conjugation here, which elsewhere is the equivalent of the stative. He claimed to have discovered that the sounds *š* and *s* are rendered by *iš*, whereas *iš*₁₁ represents *t* and *ṭ*. Sollberger later commented that this is "purely graphic" in dependence on the following phoneme. Krebernik held that the claim of *ya*, *yak*, etc. as a reading for *i*, *ik*, is not justified by the variants in spelling. He repeated that as in Akkadian, the feminine prefix is used for the verbal element in women's names even though a male god is its subject; he added, however, that some names with prefix *t-* are masculine, and therefore may be a *second*-person verb. He concluded that the morphology of the verbal system was homogeneous except for some dialectal variants; and with significant resemblances to Akkadian. In the discussion, Gelb held out high praise for all of Krebernik's work (confirmed by the intensity of interest in the rest of the questions), but objected to taking *yas* as a prefix (for *yiš*) and *ti-ab-ba-am* as against Old-Akkadian [Edzard interposed that this is no problem; the problem is the Amarna *plural* form]. Sollberger agreed with the Akkadian character of Eblaite, and was grateful for the mention that in these texts there really were some vocalic endings, because in his texts there were none. Gordon asked if there were more examples of Semitic *da* besides *da-ka-ra* which could be Arabic *škr* "give thanks" (answer: *šutum* and others); Ugaritic treats *d* in two different ways.

The paper of most immediate and extensive interest to biblical scholarship was Chicago professor Dennis Pardee's on "An Evaluation of the Proper Names from Ebla from a West Semitic Perspective: Pantheon Distribution according to Genre". He had been originally asked to deal with "religiosity

and ideology", but decided to limit himself to the presence or absence of divine *names*, not divinities; i.e. a philological and not history-of-religions approach. The gods most worshiped, as often elsewhere, are not those most frequent in proper names. Theophoric names reveal religiosity, whereas ideology is revealed in ritual and narrative texts. Thus for example Ya(hweh) is a very frequent element in names even of Christians today, but is *never* used in Jewish liturgy nor in traditional Christian theology.

In the Bible there are seven names for [the true] God (including *eloah*, *elyon*, *šadday*), in extrabiblical sources only two; there are no significant differences between the two groups. But in theophoric names there is a *big* difference. Yahweh in full *never* occurs in a name, nor do Eloah, Elohim, Elyon. In some proper names we find the names of *rejected* divinities, and also of divinities not explicitly rejected in the Bible. Thus we can distinguish three levels: the first level uses only one divine name [YHWH] and one appellative [*elohim*] and expresses the official doctrine; a second level tolerates *seven* divine names; a third level, of popular religiosity, reckons with many others.

When we pass to Phoenician sources, the problem is more acute. There are 50 deities, 11 well known, like Baal and Ashtar (also elsewhere) and Ešmun; 14 are borrowed, of which 9 are in proper names and 5 not (Isis yes, Nergal no); El is common in names but never separately as a god except "creator", *el koneh areš*. One gets the impression that a new theology has taken over; Carthaginian proper names bear this out; but we should be wary of generalizing on the fact that some names are known only as theophoric elements, never separately for a god; because this was the case with Šid for many years before it was found separately. Of 100 divine names in myths only a third appear in rituals and vice versa. All but two of Ugaritic pantheon names appear in ritual texts; 14 of 28 pantheon names do not appear in proper names. Conclusion: the Ugarit pantheon-list seems to constitute an ideological statement.

What we derive as a guideline for Ebla is this: the divine names are *meaningful*; there are degrees in the conservatism of their retention, more in toponyms than in personal names (the common *zīm[r]* "refuge" came gradually to be "mistaken" for the homonym "music"). Poetic uses are more conservative than prose. Proper names tell us little about mythology, about the *nature* of the deity and beliefs about him; only that his *help* is wanted. Three categories are proposed: deities found in myths, prose, and personal names are the most important; then those found seldom outside a personal name; finally those found *only* in personal names, presumably as an object of limited clan-veneration. Therefore in Ebla we may expect: (1) different divine names will occur in different genres; (2) names should be meaningful; (3) they may contain elements which have lost their original significance (this is hard to verify in the case of Ebla since we have virtually no earlier evidence); (4) personal names tell us the popularity of the deity but not his nature; (5) and do not necessarily reflect the real cult. The "lists of Ebla" are not really lists of what was *at* Ebla but officially-designated Ebla correspondences, "learned equivalents of Sumerian deities". 60 deities appear in ARET texts, of which 35 are in proper names, and of these 13 also separate-

ly; 23 theophoric elements of names do not appear as deities. Pettinato also gives 60 deities, but only 8 of these are as in ARET.

Pardee concluded with the arresting claim that in all these polytheisms the votaries got along pretty well with one another and their diverging gods did not cause hostilities; whereas real monotheism began in Israel after 750 B.C. and "resulted in a fratricidal order".

The discussion consisted chiefly of Sznycer's impassioned protest that despite the undeniable interest of statistics, he is wholly against this approach. How can we take the whole Bible, which involves many centuries and different cultures, and reduce them all to a formula like "7 to 2"? Also there are no "Phoenician names" but many separate cities called Phoenician (not to say Punic). Despite the chairman's inquiry whether there were any "milder" comments, Pardee answered with great equanimity that before doing his research he would have agreed fully with what Sznycer just said; but what he *found* in the various corpora seemed to him to justify his conclusions even for disparate corpora.

Professor Cyrus Gordon of New York University then gave his paper "Divine Names in ARET 5 and in the Incantations" [recently published by J. Naveh]. As he had earlier mentioned in the case of Kura-el, this form occurring in the late magic texts may be a debased form of the early religion. Ebla *il-li-hu*, "father of the gods" is Enlil (and seems to occur once in a Virolleaud Ugaritic transcription); but from this we get the Hebrew word for non-god, *elil* (rather than from a root meaning "there is not"). *aš* is not 'iš "live", but *heš* "practice divination": El invites the various gods to perform magic to heal the king. Baal and Mot are the two gods who are called "strong" at Ugarit; perhaps Eblaite *dana'um* "strong" is an epithet of Hadad. A Ugaritic text has the demon *hby* with the epithet "he who has two horns and a tail" [incidentally the earliest example of our modern representation of the devil]: *qarnayim* has on one side *nūr* "light" and on the other 'oz "strength", an example of what Gordon had called Janus-parallelism impossible to reproduce in translation. An Akkadian text has "I have bound you by the tails of the sun, by the horns of the moon". An Eblaite reflex of Semitic *q* is found in the word for tail. At Ebla some diphthongs appear as single vowels; Gordon traced the degradation of *yayn* "wine" into *yān* through many epochs of Semitic (noting from the Bible rather *le'an* for *le'ayn*, "where to?" — In the discussion Westenholz pointed out that *q* appears in Ebla sometimes as *š* and sometimes as *z*. Edzard suggested leaving a difficult deity unexplained ("and just adore him"); his explanation of *San-* was too remote; Gordon said "Sanballat helps", Edzard "but there are centuries in between"; Gordon, "tradition is strong; Arab peasants still use variants of Ba'al and Mot to express fertile land versus land needing fertilization!" Felice Israel praised the light shed on *yayin* type diphthongs; and recommended Segert on *q*. Krebernik noted that "tail" is attested in lexical texts.

Though the paper of John F. Healey of Durham, "The Stratigraphy of Personal Names within a West Semitic Corpus", had already been canceled, the other Tuesday afternoon papers had very long discussions, and so the paper of Professor Maurice Sznycer of Paris had to be put off to the morning

of July 17, "Observations sur certains aspects de l'onomastique religieuse syrienne d'après les textes ougaritiques et les textes d'Ebla". Also on that morning were the papers of Alan R. Millard of Liverpool, "Ebla Personal Names and Personal Names of the First Millennium in Syria and Palestine" (not cases, but a general theorizing like Pardee's; among the examples, some biblical, was the case of *Dubaḥu* = *zebah*, name given not because the child was sacrificed but was born at the time of a sacrifice); and Johannes Renger of Berlin (who had been professor at Chicago for ten years), "Zur Wurzel MLK in akkadischen Texten aus Syrien und Palästina": his conclusion was that the meaning of the verb *malāku*, rather than "counsel" as generally presumed for Amarna, works better if taken in a denominative sense, "act as a king" (including decisions requiring wisdom). The final paper, "Eblaic Prosopography" was by the Rome team of Alfonso Archi, Maria Giovanna Biga, and Lucio Milano. We may conclude by expressing special appreciation to Professor Archi for the constant unobtrusive helpfulness of his guiding hand.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

Robert NORTH S.J.

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum
Annus academicus 1985-1986. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 304, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	23	251	25	299
Fac. Orientalistica	—	—	5	5
Universi	23	251	30	304
Nationes	56	Alumni		304
Dioceses	156	Alumni		161
Inst. Religiosorum	44	Alumni		116
Inst. Religiosarum	9	Alumnae		9
Ex statu laicali	18	Alumnae		11
		Alumni		7

Laureae

Laurea in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

ZURRO RODRIGUEZ, Eduardo (2.XII.1985). *Procedimientos iterativos en la poesía ugarítica y hebrea* (Summa cum laude). Moderator: L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL.

BARTOLOMÉ, Juan José (18.XII.1985). *La verdad del Evangelio (Gal 2,5.14). La justificación por la fe y su vivencia en común* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: A. VANHOYE.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

BOTTINO, Adriana, «Io sono la porta». *Esegesi e storia dell'interpretazione di Gv 10,7.9* (extractum). Roma 1985.

CARNITI, Cecilia, *Il Salmo 68. Studio letterario* (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 68). Roma 1985.

KARIAMADAM, Paul, *The End of the Travel Narrative (Lk 18,31-19,46). A Redaction-Critical Investigation* (extractum). Alwaye, India 1985.

MEAGHER, Patrick, «Faith Active through Agape» (Gal 5,6). *A Study of the Formation of a Christian Community of Agape according to the Letter to the Galatians* (extractum). Roma 1984.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

En este Elenco aparecen todos los libros enviados a *Biblica*, de alguna manera relacionados con los estudios bíblicos. La mención de un título en este Elenco no implica por tanto juicio alguno acerca de la obra. El consejo de dirección determina qué libros serán recensionados en *Biblica*.

Los libros y fascículos que non han sido expresamente pedidos por *Biblica* no serán devueltos al remitente, aún cuando no parezca conveniente publicar una recensión sobre ellos.

Todos los libros y fascículos enviados a *Biblica* se trasmiten al Editor del *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus*, y aparecen en él a juicio de dicho Editor.

Envíense los libros a: Dirección *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italia.

Vetus Testamentum

Alonso Schökel, L., *Dónde está tu hermano?*. Textos de fraternidad en el libro del Génesis (Institución san Jerónimo 19). 329 p. 24 × 16. Valencia 1985. Institución San Jerónimo. \$9.00.

Amsler, Samuel, *Les Actes des Prophètes* (Essais Bibliques 9). 94 p. 21 × 14,7. Genève 1985. Labor et Fides.

Amsler, S. (et alii), *Les prophètes et les livres prophétiques* (Petite Bibliothèque des Sciences Bibliques, A.T. 4). 365 p. 20,5 × 13,5. Paris 1985. Desclée Editeurs. FF 145.00.

Anbar, Moshe, *The Amorite Tribes in Mari and the Settlement of the Israelites in Canaan*. x-250 p. 22,8 × 15,1. Tel-Aviv 1985. Tel-Aviv University.

Berlin, Adele, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. xii-179 p. 24,2 × 16. Bloomington, Indiana 1985. Indiana University Press. \$27.50.

Beyerlin, Walter, *Weisheitliche Vergewisserung mit Bezug auf den Zionskult*. Studien zum 125. Psalm (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 68). 92 p. 23,5 × 15,5 Freiburg, Schweiz – Göttingen 1985. Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. sFr. 22.—.

Blanchet, R. (et alii), *Jérémie*. Un prophète en temps de crise (Essais Bibliques 10). 180 p. 21 × 14,7. Genève 1985. Labor et Fides.

Blaszczak, Gerald R., *A Formcritical Study of Selected Odes of Solomon* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 36). ix-155 p. 22,2 × 14,5. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$13.95.

Brandscheidt, Renate, *Gotteszorn und Menschenleid. Die Gerichtsklage des leidenden Gerechten in Kgl 3* (Trierer Theologische Studien 41). ix-371 p. 23,4 × 16,2. Trier 1983. Paulinus Verlag. DM 78,—.

Brueggemann, Walter, *David's Truth in Israel's Imagination & Memory*. 128 p. 21,5 × 14. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press.

Carmichael, Calum M., *Law and Narrative in the Bible. The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue*. 356 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Ithaca, N.Y. 1985. Cornell University Press. \$38.50.

Coats, W. G. (Ed.), *Saga, Legend, Tale, Novella, Fable*. 159 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1985. JSOT Press. £14.50/\$18.50.

Davies, P. R., *Daniel*. 133 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1985. JSOT Press. £2.95/\$3.95.

De Vries, Simon J., *I Kings* (Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 12). 285 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Waco, Texas 1985. Word Books Publisher. \$19.95.

Eaton, J. H., *Job*. 68 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1985. JSOT Press. £2.95/\$3.95.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio, *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea* (V Congreso de la IOSCS). 285 p. 24,7 × 17,1. Madrid 1985. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Fishbane, Michael, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. vii-613 p. 22,2 × 14,2. Oxford 1985. Oxford University Press. £35.00.

Fox, Michael V., *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs*. v-454 p. 23,5 × 15,6. Madison 1985. The University of Wisconsin Press. \$32.50.

Freedman, D. N. - Mathews, K. A., *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*. xii-136 p. Winona Lake 1985. American Schools of Oriental Research. \$19.95.

Galbiati, Enrico - Piazza, Alessandro, *Pagine difficili della Bibbia* (Antico Testamento). 446 p. 20 × 13. Milano 1985. Massimo. Lit. 25.000.

Garsiel, Moshe, *The First Book of Samuel. A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies and Parallels*. 169 p. 23 × 15,1. Israel 1985. Revivim Publishing House. \$14.00.

Gianotto, Claudio, *Melchisedek e la sua Tipologia. Tradizioni giudaiche, cristiane e gnostiche* (sec. II a.C.-sec. III d.C.). 311 p. 23,9 × 16,7. Brescia 1984. Paideia. Lit. 40.000.

Gottwald, Norman K., *The Hebrew Bible. A Socio-Literary Introduction*. VII-702 p. 23,2 × 18. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press. \$19.95.

Jay, Pierre, *L'Exégèse de Saint Jérôme d'après son «Commentaire sur Isaïe»*. 496 p. 25,1 × 16,6. Paris 1985. Études Augustiniennes.

Kaiser, Otto, *Der Mensch unter dem Schicksal*. Studien zur Geschichte, Theologie und Gegenwartsbedeutung der Weisheit (BZAW 161) x-292 p. 23,5 × 16. Berlin – New York 1985. Walter de Gruyter. DM 98,—.

Lang, Bernhard, *Anthropological Approaches to the Old Testament* (Issues in Religion and Theology 8). 175 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Philadelphia-London 1985. Fortress Press. £3.50.

Maarsingh, B., *Ezechiël, deel I (De Prediking van het Oude Testament)*. 235 p. 23,2 × 15,2. Nijkerk 1985. Uitgeverij G. F. Callenbach BV. f 69,00.

Mayes, A. D. H., *Judges*. 98 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1985. JSOT Press. £2.95/\$3.95.

McGregor, Leslie John, *The Greek Text of Ezechiel*. An Examination of Its Homogeneity (SBL, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 18). xv-296 p. 21,5 × 14. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$13.95.

McKenzie, Steven L., *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 33). viii-219 p. 22,2 × 14,5. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$16.50.

Muraoka, T., *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. vii-206. 23 × 15,5. Jerusalem 1985. The Magnes Press. \$28.00.

Murphy, Frederick James, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (SBL, Dissertation Series, 78). ix-148 p. 21,3 × 13,7. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$10.95.

Porter, Paul A., *Metaphors and Monsters*. A Literary-Critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8. i-128 p. 20,9 × 13,7. Willowdale 1985. Dr. P. A. Porter.

Prinsloo, Willem S., *The Theology of the Book of Joel* (BZAW 163). viii-136 p. 23,5 × 16. Berlin – New York 1985. Walter de Gruyter. DM 74,—.

Rondeau, Marie-Josèphe, *Les Commentaires Patristiques du Psautier (III^e-V^e siècles)*. Vol. II Exégèse Prosopologique et Théologie (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 220). 481 p. 23,5 × 16,5. Roma 1985. Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium.

Stähli, Hans-Peter, *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 66). ix-60 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Freiburg, Schweiz – Göttingen 1985. Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. sFr. 19,—.

Trafton, Joseph, *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon*. A Critical Evaluation (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 11). vii-276 p. 21,5 × 13,6. Atlanta 1985. Scholars Press.

Weinfeld, M., *Justice and Righteousness in Israel and the Nations*. 182 p. 23 × 15,5. Jerusalem 1985. The Magnes Press. \$20.00.

Novum Testamentum

Donaldson, T. L., *Jesus on the Mountain*. 326 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1985. JSOT Press. £18.50/\$28.50.

Dupont, Jacques, *Études sur les évangiles synoptiques* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium LXX-A, LXX-B). Tome I: xxi-526 p. Tome II: p. 529-1210. Leuven 1985. University Press – Peeters. FB 2.800.

Dupont, Jacques, *Les trois apocalypses synoptiques*. Marc 13; Matthieu 24-25; Luc 21 (Lectio Divina 121). 21,5 × 13,5. 153 p. Paris 1985. Les Éditions du Cerf. F.F. 96.

Evans, Louis H., Jr., *Hebrews* (The Communicator's Commentary, Vol. 10). 259 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Waco, Texas 1985. Word Books Publisher. \$15.95.

Farris, Stephen, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives*. Their Origin, Meaning and Significance (JSNT Supplement Series 9). 220 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1985. JSOT Press. \$13.95.

Franck, Eskil, *Revelation Taught*. The Paraclete in the Gospel of John (Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 14). 168 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Lund 1985. CWK Gleerup.

Funk, Robert W. (Ed.), *New Gospel Parallels*. Volume One: The Synoptic Gospel (Foundations & Facets: New Testament). Philadelphia, PA 1985. Fortress Press.

Gamble, Harry Y., *The New Testament Canon*. Its Making and Meaning (Guides to Biblical Scholarship). 95 p. 14 × 21,5. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press.

Giblin, C. H., *The Destruction of Jerusalem according to Luke's Gospel* (Analecta Biblica 107). vii-123 p. 24 × 16,5. Roma 1985. Biblical Institute Press. Lit. 20.000; \$15.00.

Gilles, Jean, *I «fratelli e sorelle» di Gesù*. Per una lettura fedele dei Vangeli (Piccola biblioteca teologica 16) 112 p. 21 × 14,5. Torino 1985. Claudiana Editrice. Lit. 7.600.

Guillet, Jacques, *Entre Jésus et l'Église*. 313 p. 20,5 × 14. Paris 1985. Éditions du Seuil.

Harrington, Daniel J., *The New Testament*. A Bibliography (Theological and Biblical Resources, Vol. 2). 242 p. 21 × 13,5. Wilmington DL 1985. Michael Glazier, Inc. \$8.95.

Lambrecht, Jan, *The Sermon on the Mount*. Proclamation and Exhortation (Good News Studies 14). 255 p. 21,5 × 14. Wilmington, DL 1985. Michael Glazier, Inc. \$9.95.

Lyons, George, *Pauline Autobiography*. Toward a New Understanding (SBL, Dissertation Series 73). xii-273 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$15.50.

Neyrey, Jerome H., *Christ Is Community*. The Christologies of the New Testament (Good News Studies 13). 295 p. 21,5 × 14. Wilmington, DL 1985. Michael Glazier, Inc. \$12.95.

Neyrey, Jerome, *The Passion According to Luke*. A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology (Theological Inquiries). vii-232 p. 20,2 × 13,7. New York - Mahwah 1985. Paulist Press. \$8.95.

Panimolle, Salvatore Alberto, *L'Evangelista Giovanni*. Pensiero e opera letteraria del quarto evangelista. 673 p. 19,5 × 12,5. Roma 1985. Edizioni Borla. Lit. 30.000.

Paulo, Pierre-Antoine, *Le problème ecclésial des Actes à la lumière de deux prophéties d'Amos* (Recherches Nouvelle Série 3). 165 p. 24 × 15,8. Montréal-Paris 1985. Éditions du Cerf.

Pérez del Agua, Agustín, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del Nuevo Testamento* (Biblioteca Midrásica 4). 337 p. 24 × 16. Valencia 1985. Institución San Jerónimo. \$9.00.

Sabugal, Santos, *Abba'... La oración del Señor*. Historia y exégesis teológica (Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 467). xxiv-759 p. 20 × 13. Madrid 1985. La Editorial Católica, S.A.

Sabugal, Santos, *Pecado y reconciliación en el Mensaje de Jesús* (Cristianismo 1). 187 p. 21 × 15. Palermo 1985. Edizioni Augustinus. Lit. 22.000.

Sabourin, Leopold, *L'Évangile de Luc*. Introduction et commentaire. 412 p. 24,1 × 16,8. Roma 1985. Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana.

Schedl, Claus, *Zur Christologie der Evangelien*. 269 p. 23 × 15. Wien - Freiburg - Basel 1985. Herder.

Schneider, Gerhard, *Gli Atti degli Apostoli. Parte prima* (Commentario Teologico del Nuovo Testamento). 723 p. 22,5 × 15,4. Brescia 1985. Paideia.

Schneider, Gerhard, *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte*. Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk (Bonner Biblische Beiträge. Band 59). 316 p. 24,5 × 16,5. Königstein 1985. Peter Hanstein Verlag. DM 78,—.

Segalla, Giuseppe, *La Cristologia del Nuovo Testamento*. Un saggio (Studi Biblici 71). 207 p. 20,7 × 13,6. Brescia 1985. Paideia. Lit. 14.000.

Senior, Donald, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (The Passion Series 1). 200 p. 21,5 × 14. Wilmington, DL 1985. Michael Glazier, Inc. \$8.95.

Smith, D. Moody, *Johannine Christianity*. Essays on Its Setting, Sources, and Theology. ix-233 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Columbia, South Carolina 1984. University of South Carolina.

Testimonium Christi. Scritti in onore di Jacques Dupont. vii-494 p. 22,8 × 15,6. Brescia 1985. Paideia.

Thompson, William M., *The Jesus Debate*. A Survey and Synthesis. viii-437 p. 22,7 × 15,2. New York - Mahwah 1985. Paulist Press. \$12.95.

Van Belle, Gilbert, *Les parenthèses dans l'Évangile de Jean*. Aperçu historique et classification texte grec de Jean. vii-381. 23,9 × 15,8. Leuven 1985. Leuven University Press.

Via, Dan O., *The Ethics of Mark's Gospel — in the Middle of Time*. ix-242 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press.

Vögtle, Anton, *Offenbarungsgeschehen und Wirkungsgeschichte*. Neutestamentliche Beiträge. 328 p. 24 × 15,5. Freiburg - Basel - Wien 1985. Herder. DM 76,—.

Wenham, D., *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospel*. 417 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1985. JSOT Press. £16.00/\$24.00.

Willis, Wendell Lee, *Idol Meat in Corinth*. The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10. v-322 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Chico 1985. Scholars Press.

Yarbrough, O. Larry, *Not Like the Gentiles*. Marriage Rules in the Letters of Paul (SBL, Dissertation Series 80). x-150 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$11.95.

Varia

Biblical Archaeology Today. Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984. xvi-534 p. 24,7 × 17,5. Jerusalem 1985. Israel Exploration Society.

Cogan, Mordechai (Ed.), *Beer-Sheva* (Studies by the Department of Bible and Ancient Near East, Vol. II). 188 p. 24 × 16,8. Jerusalem 1985. The Magnes Press. \$25.00.

Collins, Adela Yarbro, *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship*. vii-144 p. 22,6 × 14,4. Chico 1985. Scholars Press.

Cranfield, C. E. B., *The Bible and Christian Life*. 248 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Edinburgh 1985. T. & T. Clark Limited. £6.95.

Doré, J. (et alii), *Ethique, Religion et Foi* (Le Point Théologique 43). 270 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Paris 1985. Beauchesne.

Dulles, Avery – Granfield, Patrick, *The Church: A Bibliography*. 166 p. 13×21. Wilmington 1985. Michael Glazier. \$7.95; Cloth \$15.

Fischer, Bonifatius, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften im Frühen Mittelalter* (Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel II). 454 p. 24,2×16. Freiburg 1985. Verlag Herder. \$25.00.

Garr, Randall W., *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000-586 B.C.E.* 289 p. 24×15,5. Philadelphia-London 1985. University of Pennsylvania Press. \$40.00.

Gnuse, Robert, *The Authority of the Bible*. Theories of Inspiration, Revelation and the Canon of Scripture. III-153 p. 20,1×13,6. Mahwah 1985. Paulist Press. \$6.95.

Golomb, David M., *A Grammar of Targum Neofiti* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 34). 253 p. 22,2×14. Chico 1985. Scholars Press.

Green, Henry A., *The Economic and Social Origins of Gnosticism* (SBL, Dissertation Series 77). xv-304 p. 21,5×13,5. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$12.00.

Hagen, Kenneth (et alii), *The Bible in the Churches*. How Different Christians Interpret the Scriptures. 148 p. 13,5×20,2. New York – Mahwah 1985. Paulist Press. \$8.95.

Hanson, Paul D., *L'Écriture une et diverse*. Interprétation théologique. Trad. par Jean-Pierre Bagot (Lectio Divina 122). 178 p. 21,5×13,5. Paris 1985. Les Éditions du Cerf. FF 126.

Jackson, Howard M., *The Lion Becomes Man*. The Gnostic Leontomorphic Creator and the Platonic Tradition (SBL, Dissertation Series 81). xxii-233 p. 21,5×13,5. Atlanta, Georgia 1985. Scholars Press. \$11.95.

Keel, Othmar – Schroer, Silvia, *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel* Bd. 1 (Orbis biblicus et orientalis 67). 120 p. 23,5×15,8. Freiburg, Schweiz – Göttingen 1985. Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. sFr. 29.—

Kelly, Henry Ansgar, *The Devil at Baptism*. Ritual, Theology and Drama. 301 p. 23,5×15,8. Ithaca 1985. Cornell University Press. \$32.95.

Lapide, Pinchas E., *Hebrew in the Church*. The Foundation of Jewish-Christian Dialogue. Translated by E. F. Rhodes. ix-266 p. 22×14,5. Grand Rapids, MI 1985. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. £27.95.

Maier, Johann, *The Temple Scroll*. An Introduction, Translation & Commentary (JSOT Supplement Series 34). xi-143 p. 21,5×13,5. Sheffield 1985. \$13.50.

Mazar, B. – Yadin, Y., *Eretz-Israel*. Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies. Vol. Eighteen. vii-434 p. 27,8×21,7. Jerusalem 1985. The Israel Exploration Society.

Metzger, Marcel, *Les Constitutions apostoliques*, Tome 1 (Sources Chrétiennes 320). 356 p. 19,5×12,5. Paris 1985. Le Cerf. FF 260.

Nunes Carreira, José, *Estudos de Cultura Pré-Classica*. Religiao e cultura na Antiguidade Oriental. 175 p. 20,9×13,8. Lisboa 1985. Editorial Presença.

Piediscalzi, Nicholas - Thobaben, Robert G., *Three Worlds of Christian-Marxist Encounters*. ix-220 p. 22,9×15,2. Philadelphia - London 1985. Fortress Press.

Porton, Gary G., *Understanding Rabbinic Midrash*. ix-232 p. 23×15. Hoboken, New Jersey 1985. KTAV Publishing House, Inc. \$11.95.

Rast, Walter E. (Ed.), *Preliminary Reports of ASOR-Sponsored Excavations 1981-83* (Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research Supplement 23). 135 p. 28×21,5. Winona Lake, Indiana 1985. Eisenbrauns.

Rosén, Haiim B., *East and West. Selected Writings in Linguistics*. Part Two: Hebrew and Semitic Linguistics. 359 p. 23,7×15,8. München 1984. Wilhelm Fink Verlag. DM 128,—.

Sakenfeld, Katharine Doob, *Faithfulness in Action*. vii-158 p. 21,3×13,8. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press.

Schoedel, R. William, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible). xxii-305 p. 24,3×21,5. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press.

Senior, D., - Stuhlmüller, C., *I fondamenti biblici della missione* (La Missione 6). 502 p. 20,8×14. Bologna 1985. Editrice Missionaria Italiana. Lit. 24.000.

Sigal, Pierre-André, *L'homme et le miracle dans la France médiévale (XI^e-XII^e siècle)*. 349 p. 23,5×14,5. Paris 1985. Le Cerf. FF 115.

Waschke, E. J., *Untersuchungen zum Menschenbild der Urgeschichte* (Theologische Arbeiten XLIII). 243 p. 20×14,5. Berlin 1985. Evangelische Verlagsanstalt. DM 17,50.

Zorzi, Giuseppe, *Il realismo cristiano di Reinhold Niebuhr* (Scienze religiose 8). 186 p. 21,5×14. Bologna 1984. Centro Editoriale Dehoniano. Lit. 15.000.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA - Gennaio 1985